Par. S.2.1.1.52
836

Volume I
No. 1 — 21

Wednesday
16th July, 1952

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Part I - Questions and Answers)

CONTENTS

Members Sworn [Cols. 2—18].

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

Acc 25046
Date 19.11.2014

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part I—Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 16th July, 1952

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

SHARE IN SECURED FUND

***1770. Shri S. N. Dass:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that India is going to have some share in three and a half million dollars obtained from the sale of property forcibly taken by the Japanese during the last war; and

(b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, what is the amount that India is entitled to get?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). India has received U.S. $275,290·12 and Yen 260,896·81 as her share representing 8 per cent. of the Secured Fund.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know the names of other countries that have taken a share from this fund?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The names of the other countries and their shares are as follows:

United Kingdom	12 per cent.
China	20 per cent.
The Netherlands	12 per cent.
The Phillipines	12 per cent.
Australia	8 per cent.
France	8 per cent.
Pakistan	8 per cent.
Burma	12 per cent.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether this fund forms part of the reparations from Japan?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This does not form part of reparations. It is a fund accumulated from the sale of property in Japan supposed to have been looted by the Japanese during war time from other territories. This is something apart from reparations.

Shri S. N. Das: What is the basis on which this fund has been divided?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Presumably this was done, not with our consent, long before, on the basis of damage caused to the countries. In India the damage was the least, as it was hardly in a little corner. In Burma the damage was very great, and also in the Phillipines. It is obvious that the basis can only be this, namely, where the looting was most.

YARN NOT LIFTED BY STATES

***1771. Shri S. N. Das:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a very large number of States have not been lifting their allotted quotas of yarn fully for the last three or four months?

(b) If so, what are the reasons for their doing so?

(c) What are the total quantities of yarn that different States have refused to take so far?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes.

(b) The reasons are stated to be lack of demand and sufficient stocks already with dealers.

(c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 40]

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether the restrictions on production and distribution of yarn have been relaxed, and if so, to what extent?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a wide question in regard to which I think I have given the information to the House on previous occasions.

The mills have been permitted to sell all yarn manufactured from foreign cotton, and up to 33 1/3 per cent. yarn made of Indian cotton together with all such yarn rejected by the State nominees to licensed buyers of their own choice. Simultaneously the export of yarn of foreign cotton up to 6000 bales for shipment by the end of June 1952, and another 6000 bales for shipment thereafter till the 31st August 1952 has been allowed. Also, export of yarn of Indian cotton packed in April 1952 and of prior manufacture have been allowed freely for shipment up to the end of 31st August. Control on the postal transmission of yarn has been lifted with effect from 10th May 1952 and movement permits have not to be taken with effect from the same date for movement and free sale of yarn from the mill-end to the buyers in the States. This is all that has been done in regard to relaxation of controls.

Shri S. N. Das: To what extent, the consumption of yarn by handloom industry in India has decreased?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is very difficult for us to estimate with any precision the extent to which there has been a decrease, because our statistics in regard to handlooms is extremely poor, as the last fact-finding Committee's report is about 9 years old, and is therefore completely out of date. But judging from the complaints received from the handloom weavers and the master weavers and also from the prices that obtain for handloom cloth, we feel that trade in handloom cloth is not in a very good state today, and therefore automatically the offtake of yarn from handloom weavers is also relatively poor.

Shri S. N. Das: What is the present position of stocks of yarn?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid that it is rather difficult to say anything precisely on the subject. I can only say about the position of mill stocks. The stocks of yarn in the mills are just about one month's stock. These concessions that we have given have operated to the benefit of the mills, and the stocks have moved. It is very difficult to say what is the quantity of stocks in the hands of dealers.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Are the Government making any attempts to bring up their knowledge of facts and their statistics with regard to handloom up to date?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a matter with which we are not now mainly concerned. I think we have to make that attempt before long. But I cannot say that I have the matter on hand.

Shri Veeraswamy: May I know the quantity of yarn required by the handloom weavers in Madras State, and the quantity supplied to them?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think it is rather difficult for me to answer that question off hand.

Shri Nana Das: The hon. Minister stated that large quantities of yarn are lying with the dealers; may I know whether it is due to the high prices of yarn?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It may be. There are several factors which impede the off-take of yarn at higher prices. One of the oprating factors may be the concept in the minds of the people who buy yarn that prices are high now and that they are likely to come down.

सेठ अचल सिंह : क्या माननीय मन्त्री को पता है कि आजकल सूत कंट्रोल भाव से नीचे बिक रहा है, और ऐसी हालत में बहां कंट्रोल उठाने की कृपा करेंगे ?

Mr. Speaker: The question is whether it is being sold at lesser than control rates?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a very happy position, Sir, if our rates are not followed, and the rulling prices are less than controlled rates.

Seth Govind Das: Under these circumstances, is there any proposal to remove the control on yarn, when prices of these are going down?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If prices have gone down below the limits fixed by Government, as I said, that is a position which we welcome. But that does not mean that we should lift controls because there is no guarantee that the prices will stay at that leavel. My information is that in the case of many categories of yarn and cloth, the prices are moving a little upward.

BHAKRA DAM

***1772. Shri S. C. Samanta:** (a) Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state how far the construction of the two Diversion Tunnels of the Bhakra Dam had progressed upto the 31st March, 1952?

(b) What are the diameters of the Tunnels?

(c) What is the estimated cost of these two Tunnels?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) A statement showing the progress of work on each of the two Diversion Tunnels at Bhakra upto 31st March 1952 is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 41]

(b) When completed inside diameter of the two Diversion Tunnels will be 50 feet each while the excavated diameter upto rock is about 58 feet.

(c) Rs. 3·26 crores approximately.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know from the hon. the Minister as to how these two tunnels will be utilised when the Bhakra dam will be completed?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: They are there for diversion while the work is being completed. After carrying the cables, one of the channels will not be needed.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know the surface of inner diameter of the tunnels, has been constructed, whether with gravity type concrete or anything else?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I want notice.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know whether the work on these tunnels is according to schedule or whether there has been any delay?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I do not think it is very much behind hand. There was a little damage last year on account of floods, which delayed matters a bit.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know whether the cost mentioned by the hon. Minister is the recent estimate, or whether it is previous one?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The latest estimate, Sir.

TRADE WITH U.S.S.R.

***1773. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) what quantities of jute and tea were exported to U.S.S.R. in 1948-49, 1949-50 and 1951-52;

(b) whether it is a fact that no jute, tea and castor oil were exported to U.S.S.R. in 1950-51;

(c) if so, what are the reasons; and

(d) the extent to which the imports from U.S.S.R. have increased since 1948-49 (year by year and item by item)?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) A statement giving the required information is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 42]

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) There was no export of raw jute due to short supply in the country. The other items were apparently not needed by the Soviets during these periods.

(d) A statement giving the required information is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 43]

Shri S. C. Samanta: Sir, the statement shows that our export to U.S.S.R. is decreasing year by year. May I know what are the main reasons for this and why raw jute was not exported in 1950-51?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, in regard to decline of trade, as the hon. Member knows, the normal trade factors do not operate in this particular instance. It is a question of two Governments acting and the only surmise I would make at this moment is that the Soviet Government does not wish to import the articles which they were importing in the past. So far as raw jute is concerned, I have already said it is in short supply in this country and the policy of this Government is not to encourage the export of raw jute.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, the sort of arrangement or agreement on trade with the U.S.S.R.?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is on a Government to Government basis and very largely on the barter basis.

Shri Raghavaiah: There was an offer made by the Soviet representative at the Bombay exhibition. Have the Government considered the possibility of enhancing trade with the Soviet Union on the basis of the offer of the U.S.S.R. to supply goods and accept payment in Indian currency?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not at the moment able to recollect the offer. If the hon. Member puts down a question. I will make an attempt to answer.

Shri Nana Das: May I know, Sir, the principal aritcles that we imported from U.S.S.R.? Is there any possibility of importing capital goods?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In regard to the first part of the question. I would invite the hon. Member's attention to the statement laid on the Table. In regard to the second part, I have no information.

Shri Punnoose: Has it come to the notice of the Government that the U.S.S.R. offered to supply us with food, and not only with food, but also machinery, provided we are prepared to give our articles in return?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I can take that information from the hon. member.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Is it a fact that in these barter deals the Russian Government has been too exacting and the negotiations had to be prolonged and protracted over a long period because of the difficulty in satisfying the U.S.S.R. Government?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have no information.

JUTE MANUFACTURES

***1774. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the effect on orders from the U.S.A. for jute manufactures as a result of the reduction of the export duties recently?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): American purchases of burlap in India increased from 26 million yards in April 1952 to 119 million yards in May 1952. June purchases are expected to be good.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know, Sir, whether the reduction in the export duty on raw jute has enabled India to underquote her European rivals?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is correct, Sir.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know, Sir, whether the Government expects to win back the lost market in jute as a result of this reduction of export duty?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is also right, Sir.

INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL

***1775. Shri S. C. Samanta:** (a) Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state how many and which countries participated in the International Film Festival organised in India in 1951-52?

(b) What was the number of delegates from each country?

(c) What was the total expenditure incurred by the Government of India for and in connection with the Festival?

(d) Is India invited in similar Festivals in other countries?

(e) If so, which of the Festivals were attended by India since 1947?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) and (b). A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No 44]

(c) Rs. 82,158-4-0.

(d) Yes, Sir.

(e) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 45]

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, how many feature films and documentaries were shown in this festival at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay and Delhi?

Dr. Keskar: Sir, this is given in the statement with the names of all the feature films that were shown.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, whether films for children and 'puppet' films were also shown?

Dr. Kesker: A few films for children and 'puppet' films by foreign producers were also shown at this festival.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, what arrangements are being made by our Government to produce children's films and 'puppet' films?

Dr. Keskar: One of the main objects of holding this festival was to show to our producers the utility and popularity of such films, and we hope that after seeing these films they will also take up similar production.

Shri Raghavaiah: May I know, Sir, what arrangements had been made by the Government of India for the tour of the film delegates in this country? If so, what is the expenditure incurred by the Government of India towards that?

Dr. Keskar: Sir, this delegation toured at their own expense and we did not incur any expenditure for their tour.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Which were the towns in India to which this festival moved during its exhibition?

Dr. Keskar: The festival was held in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Delhi.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Was the response encouraging?

Dr. Keskar: Yes, Sir. The festival was very successful.

KOSI PROJECT

***1777. Shri L. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Advisory Committee on the Kosi Project has recommended immediate construction of Belka Dam Scheme in view of the urgency of the Kosi flood problem;

(b) if so, whether the Government of India have accepted the said recommendation; and

(c) how Government propose to apportion financial responsibilities between the State of Bihar and the Government of Nepal?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) Yes, Sir; the Advisory Committee have *inter alia* recommended the construction of a storage dam at Belka Hill site in Nepal.

(b) The Government of India have asked for the preparation of a revised project estimate report, incorporating the main features of the Advisory Committee Report along with other features to give increased food production, and have authorised necessary field studies for the purpose.

(c) The question of apportioning the financial responsibilities between the State of Bihar and the Government of Nepal does not arise at this stage.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know, Sir, the estimated comparative cost of this Belka Dam and the old Kosi Dam project?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: As far as I remember, Sir, the estimate of the old Kosi dam project was about Rs. 135 crores, and that of the Belka dam project Rs. 66 crores.

Shri L. N. Mishra: Is it a fact that in view of the smaller expenditure and greater immediate corresponding gains, the Government of Bihar have shown their preference to the Belka dam scheme?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The final project is not ready, but it is probable that the Government of Bihar may prefer the latter project.

Shri L. N. Mishra: In reply to part (c), may I know, Sir, whether there are some international conventions on such matters?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: No, Sir.

Shrimati Sushama Sen: May I know, Sir, what relief the Central Government propose to give to the 5 lakhs people who have been affected by the recent Kosi flood?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The question of immediate relief, Sir, lies within the province of the State Government.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know, Sir, whether it is the intention of Government to prepare an integrated project estimate of the Belka-Kosi project or to take up this dam piecemeal?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Well, Sir, the information given shows that we are aiming at a smaller but still an integrated project.

MANGANESE ORE AND MICA

***1778. Shri L. N. Mishra:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that of late there has been a fall in the demand from abroad for manganese ore and mica?

(b) If so, what are the reasons for the same?

(c) What has been the loss of Revenue on this account in the year 1951-52 as compared with the figures for the year 1950-51?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) There has been a fall in the demand from abroad for certain varieties of mica. There is no fall in the demand for manganese ore.

(b) The demand for mica has always been of a flactuating nature. The immediate cause for a decline in exports is said to be the improved stock position in some of the buying countries.

(c) There has been no loss of Revenue on this account.

Shri L. N. Mishra: Is the fall in demand a temporary one or something like permanent?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: We hope it is a temporary one, Sir.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Sir, do the Government of India keep figures of stocks in the country, and if so, what are the stocks of manganese ore and mica at the present moment.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have no information, Sir.

Shri Nana Das: Will Government be able to tell us how long this lull in the demand for mica from abroad will continue and whether Government proposes to take any steps to obviate the danger and save the mica industry?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The first part of the question, I am afraid, is a thing which I am unable to answer with any precision. As regards the second, I would like to have notice.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know what are the countries to which mica and manganese are exported and what is the total value of that export?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Manganese ore is exported to U.K., Sweden, Norway, Western Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Canada, U.S.A. and several other countries besides. The quantity exported in 1951-52 was 2,28,67,120 cwts. and the value was nearly Rs. 16 crores.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know whether the falling off in demand of mica is due to the production of synthetic varieties of mica abroad or is it due to any deterioration in the quality of the mica produced here?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The general belief is that it is due to stockpiling, mainly.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Will the hon. Minister kindly indicate whether there is any plan for the processing of manganese ores before they are exported?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would like to have notice.

Shri Meghnad Saha: That is, instead of exporting ores we could export the metal. We could set up a factory for making the metal and then export the metal. Otherwise you lose a large amount of money.

Mr. Speaker: He need not argue now. He may ask for information. Can the hon. Minister give that information?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As I said, I would like to have notice.

Shri Bhagwat Jha: Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the fact that there is a big deposit of manganese in Singbhum hills down to Mayurbhanj State and that it still remains untapped?

Mr. Speaker: He is giving information.

NAVIGATION IN HOOGLY

***1779. Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state:

(a) the position with regard to the improvement of the navigational problems in Hoogly between the Bay of Bengal and Calcutta as a result of the experiment carried out at the Poona Research Station;

(b) whether Government propose to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the report of the Research Station for the current year;

(c) the number of other model projects in hand at the Poona Research Station; and

(d) the number of Research Stations of the type at Poona working out such experimental model projects?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The experiments for improving navigability of the Hoogly River and its estuary are still in progress at the Central Water and Power Research Station, Poona. Difficult reaches such as Sankral, Fulta Point and James and Mary Reach—Eastern and Western Guts are being successfully tackled. A repelling spur which will improve Sankral Reach has been finalised and results are being communicated to the Port Commissioners. Calcutta.

(b) Technical report of the Station for the current year (1951) is still under preparation. A summary of the same is, however, placed on the Table of the House. [*Copies placed in the Library. See No.* P-57/52.]

(c) Twenty-four other model experiments for various projects are in hand at the Poona Research Station.

(d) Five.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: May I know whether proper funds are available for the working of this research station?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Yes, Sir.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: During my last visit to Poona I noticed that the work of this Research Station was suffering because of lack of funds, and therefore I asked this question. May I know if this year proper arrangements have been made for the financing of this Research Station?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The Department has received no complaint about inadequacy of funds.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: May I know whether the researches made in Poona in connection with the Madras Port have been successful?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I require notice, Sir. This question was in connection with the Hoogly, now we have gone down to Madras.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Are any experiments being carried on regarding the Ganga Barrage scheme?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Well, now we have gone up to the Ganga Barrage.

Mr. Speaker: His point as I have understood it is that experiments in respect of all places in India are being carried on at Poona. So, is any experiment in connection with the problem at Ganga Barrage being carried on at Poona.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is what I am pleading. Sir. This question related primarily to the navigational problems of Hoogly, and I require notice in regard to the Ganga Barrage.

श्री टी० एन० सिंह : अभी आपने बतलाया कि वहां जो रिसर्च हो रही है उसके लिये वहां के अफसरों की तरफ से कोई मांग नहीं की गई है। क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि वहां वाकई उन लोगों को अपना रिसर्च करने के लिये स्थान की कमी है, यानी जो नहरें वहां वनती हैं उनके लिये थोड़ा सा और अधिक स्थान चाहिये और इस विषय में क्या उन्होंने कोई मांग नहीं की हैं ?

श्री सी० डी० देशमुख : हमारे पास तो इसकी कोई जानकारी नहीं है।

Shri Meghnad Saha: Is the Government aware that if the Ganga Barrage scheme comes into operation the Diamond Harbour Scheme will be absolutely unnecessary?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am sorry, sir, I have got no information.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूं कि पूना सेंट्रल वाटर ऐन्ड पावर रिसर्च स्टेशन में हुगली के विषय में जो अनुसंधान किया गया है, उसको सरकार ने क्या कार्यान्वित किया है ?

श्री सी० डी० देशमुख : जहां तक मैं जानता हूं उनका पूरा निवेदन अभी तक शासन के पास नहीं पहुंचा।

YARN AND CLOTH CONTROL

***1780. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government propose to relax the existing controls on cloth and yarn?

(b) If so, when this relaxation is likely to be given effect to?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). The position regarding controls on cloth and yarn is kept under constant review and changes are made as and when found necessary.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Is it a fact that some of the bigger States like Bombay and Madras are against continuance of cloth control?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have had no communication from them on that subject, Sir.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know how long the free sales concession given to textile mills will be kept in force?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In regard to coarse and medium cloth the concession extends up to 31st August, 1952, in regard to fine and superfine it extends up to a month more—that is the present position.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: In view of the fact that the cloth and yarn supply position has become easy at the moment, may I know whether Government propose to further bring down their prices?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: One has nothing to do with the other.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether Government is in communication with the State Governments in regard to lifting of control in this matter?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The Central Government have not taken any initiative in this matter.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Has there been any relaxation so far as the control on cloth is concerned and, if so, what is the present position so far as that relaxation is concerned?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid this question has been asked and answered. The relaxation has been made in regard to movement and sale of coarse and medium cloth up to 80 per cent. of the production of a mill, and that relaxation will obtain until the 31st August, 1952. Similar concessions have been made in regard to fine and superfine cloth and these will obtain till the 30th September, 1952.

सेठ अचल सिंह : क्या माननीय मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि उन्होंने जो कपड़े पर से कन्ट्रोल ढीला किया है, तो क्या उत्तर प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट द्वारा उसे ढीला कराने का प्रयत्न करेंगे ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As I understand it, if it is a question of the U. P. Government co-operating with us, I think I may say that we are assured that the U. P. Government will do its best.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether the existing control regulations amount to decontrol at the distribution stage?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a matter of opinion.

INDIA'S FOREIGN TRADE

***1781. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the figures of India's foreign sea and air borne trade on private and Government accounts since the beginning of this calendar year?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): The information is not available.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: How long would Government take to make this information available?

Mr. Speaker: It is not a question of trying for the information. He said that it is not available at all.

Shri K. K. Basu: Do the Government propose to set up some machinery to collect this information?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN RESPECT OF BIHAR MICA MINES

***1782. Shri N. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any Advisory Committee to advise the Central Government on matters arising out of the administration of Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1946 has been constituted so far for Bihar;

(b) if so, who are the members of the Committee; and

(c) who represents the interests of labour?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). (1) Shri R. S. Misra, Welfare Commissioner—*Chairman.*

(2) Shri M. R. Huda, Mica Controller, Bihar—*Vice-Chairman.*

(3) Shri B. P. Singh, Commissioner of Labour, Bihar.

(4) Shri Sukhlal Singh, Member, Bihar Legislature.

(5) Shri R.G. Agarwala.	Represent the mica owners of Bihar.
(6) Shri Bandhanram Bhadani.	
(7) Shri Rameshwar Pandey.	
(8) Shri Hitnarain Singh.	Represent the Mica miners' association.
(9) Shrimati Radhika Devi.	
(10) Shri Shah Ramzan Ali Shah.	

Shri N. P. Sinha: How many sittings did this Board hold during 1951?

Shri V. V. Giri: I have not got the information at present. I will be able to inform him later.

Shri N. P. Sinha: May I know if the Board has advised the Government that the water near about the mica mines is highly malarious and some effective arrangements should be made for supply of good drinking water?

Shri V. V. Giri: I take the information from the hon. Member. I shall issue necessary instructions.

Shri Nana Das: May I know whether a similar Committee has been appointed in the Madras State, and if so, who are its members?

Shri V. V. Giri: There is an advisory committee for the mica miners in the Gudur area.

Shri B. S. Murthy: What are the functions of this committee and how far are its decisions binding?

Shri V. V. Giri: Its function is to advise on various matters relating to the welfare of the miners.

Shri K. K. Basu: Arising out of part (c) of the question, may I know what are the specific qualifications of the labour representatives?

Shri V. V. Giri: They should be representatives of various labour organisations.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Since the supplementaries in regard to questions 1783 and 1784 are likely to overlap, may I suggest that these two questions may be taken together?

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Minister agreeable?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am entirely in the hands of the House. If you so desire, I am prepared to answer them together.

Mr. Speaker: Then Mr. Ramaswamy may put both the questions together.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: They are not likely to overlap. They are different. Still, I shall put both of them together.

HANDLOOM CLOTH (EXPORT)

***1783. Shri S. V. Ramaswami:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the export of handloom cloth has dwindled considerably in recent years;

(b) if so, the causes of such decline; and

(c) what steps are being taken to increase the export in handloom cloth?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). There has been a decline in export of handloom cloth during the last two years owing to lack of demand and restrictions in foreign markets.

(c) The Government of India Trade Representatives abroad have been furnished with samples of Indian handloom textiles for exhibiting in their show rooms and have been especially asked to give wide publicity to Indian handloom cloth. In Trade Agreements also the Government of India make provision for the export of handloom cloth as far as possible. Further measures to stimulate export are under consideration.

COMPETITION BETWEEN MILLS AND HANDLOOMS

*1784. **Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that there is unrestricted competition between Mills and Handlooms in the production of all categories of cloth?

(b) Have representations been made to Government to define the field of production of cloth by Mills?

(c) Have representations been made to Government to prevent the Mills from producing coarse varieties of *sarees* and *dhoties.*

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) There is no such unrestricted competition.

(b) Yes. Certain items of textiles have already been reserved for production exclusively by the handlooms.

(c) Yes.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Are Government aware that two concrete suggestions were made at the Handloom Weavers' Conference held at Salem in April, namely, that the Central Government should help the handloom industry firstly by starting a Handloom Export Finance Corporation and secondly by sending out a trade delegation to those countries to which we have been exporting our handloom goods, so that we may study on the spot the reasons for the decline and suggest remedies for improving the trade?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think the matter was brought to my notice by the hon. Member himself.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Do Government contemplate sending out a trade delegation for the purpose of studying the position at first hand?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: There has been some suggestion from the Madras Government that they should send out people to various countries, or to the countries nearby. This matter was mentioned to me by the representative of the Madras Government when I visited Madras last. I do not know how far the matter has progressed.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Are Government considering the other suggestion regarding the starting of a Handloom Export Finance Corporation?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Not in the terms that my hon. friend seems to have in mind.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Are Government aware that owing to lack of control over quality our export has fallen, and are Government taking any steps to ensure that only quality products are exported from our country?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: To ensure that only quality products are exported in the matter of handlooms means some kind of quality control in the matter of production. At the moment, I am afraid it is rather too big a step for the Government even to contemplate.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Are Government aware that there is large scale unemployment and acute distress among the handloom weavers and thousands and thousands of people have gone out of the trade and are begging even in the streets of Delhi?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Subject to a certain amount of exaggeration in the news that is usually put out, Government are aware that there is distress among the people enagaged in this industry.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: The hon. Minister said that there was no unrestricted competition. May I know what is the restriction? Are there defined spheres as between the mills and the handlooms.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes, Sir. Mills are not permitted to produce sarees with borders exceeding 2 inches and there are various other restrictions in regard to the production of *saris*. Similarly, as regards *dhotis*, mills are not permitted to produce *dhotis* with borders exceeding ¼ of an inch width. I can place on the Table a copy of the entire restrictions. It is a whole page actually. That is why I said that there is no unrestricted competition.

Shri A. M. Thomas: May I know whether Government, in view of the mounting stocks, have issued any directions for the purchase of Government requirements from handloom shops?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: So far as the State Governments are concerned. I understand that the particular State in which my hon. friend is interested, namely, Madras, is making determined and strenuous efforts to make people take more of handloom cloth—I mean, not merely Government purchases but purchases by private people also, as far as possible.

So far as the Central Government is concerned, I think that my hon. colleague on my right has taken the initiative in this matter and has given directions that stores purchases by Government should not be merely determined on the basis of price preference but that handloom cloth must necessarily be given some kind of preference in the matter of purchases.

Shri A. M. Thomas: May I know whether the Government have called for any statistics concerning the stock now in hand?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: This is a matter primarily within the competence of the State Government. I might assure my hon. friend that I am in touch with the position. I have had discussions, as I said before, with the representative of the Madras Government when I went to Madras. I have sent out the Deputy Secretary who is in charge of textiles in my Ministry recently to Madras to have a first-hand study of the position along with an expert from the Textile Commissioner's office. We are in touch with the Madras Government so as to find out what the position is and also to assist them in some measure, to the extent possible.

Shri Damodara Menon: May I know, Sir, whether in defining the respective limits of production of handlooms and mills, Government have taken into consideration the demand in foreign markets of handloom products?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, these restrictions were laid down some time back and I can tell the hon. Member that we propose reviewing these restrictions. It is my intention to appoint a small committee at expert level to review these restrictions to find out whether something more cannot be done. When that is done, the point that has been mentioned by the hon. Member would be taken into account.

Shri Venkataraman: Are the Central Government aware of the recommendations of the Handloom Enquiry Committee appointed by the Government of Madras that cloth of the width of 36 inches and less should be manufactured in mills and cloth of the width of over 36 inches should be left to the handloom? Has Government taken any decision on that?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would like to know when that Handloom Enquiry Committee was appointed. There have been various committees appointed—I do not know which committee the hon. Member has in mind.

Shri Venkataraman: The Committee over which Dr. B. V. Narayanaswami Naidu presided.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is rather......

Shri Venkataraman: Then I shall write a letter to him.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Do Government contemplate starting a 'Buy Handloom' movement in order to help this industry?

ACCIDENT IN SINGARANI COAL MINE

***1785. Shri Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the causes for the accident resulting in the death of two workers and serious injury to another in the Birley Pit of Singarani Collieries, Kothagudium, during the early hours of the 15th April, 1952;

(b) whether any enquiry was instituted;

(c) if the reply to part (b) above be in the affirmative, who conducted the enquiry; and

(d) whether Government propose to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the findings?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) The accident was due to a mass of coal which fell off a slip in the corner of a pillar.

(b) Yes.

(c) Shri B. M. Bhat, Junior Inspector of Mines.

(d) It will not be proper to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the report as it contains information which has been acquired by the officer in the course of his investigation and which, under section 10 of the Mines Act, 1952, has to be regarded as confidential.

Shri Vittal Rao: Is it a fact that the practice of lending support to loose roofs and loose coal seams by means of logs of sawn-timber has been given up in order to economise expenditure?

Shri V. V. Giri: I do not think so.

Shri Vittal Rao: Is it a fact that the accident could have been avoided if there had been proper inspection of mines by the pit manager and the assistant pit manager?

Shri V. V. Giri: There has always been a proper inspection and the supervising officials are generally careful.

Shri Raghavaiah: Was any compensation given to the families of the deceased workers?

Shri V. V. Giri: I am sure, it would have been given.

WORKERS OF SINGARANI COLLIERIES

***1786. Shri Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) how many workers of Singarani Collieries, Kothagudium, have been provided with quarters;

(b) the number of those living in the huts; and

(c) the number of those who are not provided either with quarters or huts?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) 4,500.

(b) 6,500.

(c) 500 as they stay in villages outside the colliery area.

Shri Vittal Rao: May I know the amount set apart for housing for the year 1952-53?

Shri V. V. Giri: I have not got that information here. But I may say that after the integration of Hyderabad State was effected and the welfare fund was taken over by the Central Government the colliery owners have been promised a subsidy for building houses and today 320 of them have been completed up to the basement level. A request for subsidy for these houses is under consideration.

Shri Vittal Rao: Out of the sum of Rs. 20 lakhs earmarked for housing in Hyderabad State, how much has been allocated for housing in mine areas?

Shri V. V. Giri: I will be glad to have notice of that question and I shall answer it exhaustively.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether the mine-owners have any scheme for housing of labourers and if so, how many houses on a permanent basis are to be constructed annually?

Shri V. V. Giri: That depends upon the funds available.

Mr. Speaker: But have they got any scheme of regular housing—that is his question.

Shri V. V. Giri: They are considering a regular scheme. This committee is only functioning just now after integration.

Shri K. K. Basu: Is the Government in a position to tell us when these 6,000 labourers who are living in huts will be provided with living room?

Shri V. V. Giri: As soon as possible.

DISPLACED PERSONS TRAINED IN VOCATIONAL TRADES

***1787. Shri Vidyalankar:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of displaced persons trained in vocational trades up to 31st March, 1952;

(b) the number of those proposed to be trained in the year 1952-53, and the expenditure to be incurred for this; and

(c) the number of displaced persons so trained, who are gainfully employed in the same line, and the number of those, who are employed in any other line, and number of those who are still unemployed?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) 59,673.

(b) (i) 23,642.

(ii) Rs. 1,35,09,200.

(c) The information is not available.

Shri Vidyalankar: Does Government keep any records to find out how far the refugees have really been benefited by this technical training?

Shri A. P. Jain: During the course of the Budget Debate I said that we have not much information about these trainees. When a trainee leaves the institution, it is up to him to supply the information or not. Unfortunately. very few of those who receive training supply information about their subsequent employment or work.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : क्या मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से पूछ सकता हूं कि जिन लोगों को भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के पेशों की शिक्षा दी जाती है उन शिक्षित लोगों को सरकार नौकरी में लगा लेती है या उनको वाहरी काम में लगाया जाता है । और क्या ऐसे भी कोई लोग हैं जिनको अभी तक काम नहीं मिला है ?

श्री ए० पी० जैन : सरकार के पास तो आम तौर से कोई काम होता नहीं है, लेकिन जो निजी तौर से उद्योग धंध करने वाले लोग होते हैं उनके यहां इन लोगों को नौकरी मिल जाती है या वह अपना काम शुरू कर देते हैं। कुछ ऐसे लोग भी हो सकते हैं जिन्होंने काम नहीं किया और कुछ ऐसे भी हो सकते हैं जिनको काम नहीं मिल सका ।

Shri B. K. Das: With reference to answer to parts (a) and (b) of the question, may I have separate figures with regard to West Bengal?

Shri A. P. Jain: The number of displaced persons trained in West Bengal in vocational trades up to 31st March 1952 was 7,528. The number proposed to be trained in 1952-53 is 11,970.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Have Government considered the question of taking up a survey to find out what number or percentage of trainees have really been employed in any vocation?

Shri A. P. Jain: I cannot promise that. It is a question of money. The trainees are spread all over India and what would be the amount required for carrying out such a survey has yet to be investigated. Whether it would we worth while carrying out such a survey, I do not know.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जो लोग स्वयं अपना पेशा शुरू करना चाहते हैं उन्हें क्या सरकार कोई धन लोन के रूप में देती है ।

श्री ए० पी० जैन : जी हां, देती है और अभी जो एक नई विज्ञप्ति निकाली गई थी उसमें कहा गया था कि आइन्दा जो छोटे कर्जे हैं वह उन्हीं लोगों को दिये जायेंगे जो इस प्रकार के कामों की शिक्षा पा कर के निकलेंगे। उस बात पर अमल किया जायेगा ?

नदी घाटी परियोजनाएं

*१७८८. **सेठ गोविन्द दास** : क्या **सिंचाई तथा विद्युत** मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि भारत सरकार द्वारा हाथ में ली गई नदी घाटी परियोजनाओं से भारत के किन भागों को लाभ पहुंचने की प्रत्याशा है और किस वर्ष से ये परियोजनायें खाद्यान्न-उत्पादन की वृद्धि में सहायता देने लगेगी ?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): The Government of India have not directly undertaken any river valley project in India. However, they are financfng the execution of the Hirakud, Bhakara-Nangal and Damodar Valley Projects. A statement is placed on the Table of the House indicating the areas benefited by these schemes and the year in which they will begin to help in further food production.

STATEMENT

Name of Project	Areas to be benefited	Year from which further food production will result.
Bhakra-Nangal	Hissar, Rohtak, Karnal and Ferozepur districts of Punjab (I) ; Bikaner division in Rajasthan and Patiala district in PEPSU.	1951-52
Hirakund	Sambalpur, Cuttack and Puri districts in Orissa State.	1955-56
Damodar Valley Schemes.	Burdwan, Howrah, Hooghly and Bankura districts in West Bengal.	1952-53

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जो स्टेटमेंट माननीय मंत्रीं जी ने रखा है, क्या उसमें से वह यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि यह तीनों योजनायें कब से काम करना शुरू कर देंगी ।

श्री सी० डी० देशमुख : वर्ष तो बताया हैं ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : वही मैं जानना चाहता हूं क्योंकि सब लोग स्टेटमेंट नहीं पढ़ते हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने तो स्टेटमेंट पढ़ा है ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं ने तो देखा है बहुत से लोग नहीं जानते हैं । इसलिये मैं केवल यह जानना चाहता हूं कि कौनसे वर्ष में यह तीनो काम शुरू होंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : स्टेटमेंट में दिया है ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं केवल उन वर्षों की संख्या जानना चाहता हूं ।

Mr. Speaker: Let him put any other question.

श्री राधे लाल व्यास : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जिन तीन प्रोजेक्ट्स का माननीय मंत्री जी ने जिक्र किया है उसमें नहरें बनाने का खर्चा प्रति मील क्या है ?

श्री सी० डी० देशमुख : इसका अलग विवरण तो मेरे पास नहीं है ।

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know what steps Government have taken on the recommendations of the Estimates Committee for the efficient and early execution of these three projects?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The report is still under consideration.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं । मेरा यह सावल हिन्दी में दिया गया है, और जो सवाल हिन्दी में दिये जाते हैं उनका उत्तर हिन्दी में क्यों नहीं मिलता, उनका उत्तर अंग्रेजी में क्यों मिलता है ।

Mr. Speaker: English is permitted; even now I am replying in English.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं यह आशा करता हूं कि जो मंत्री महोदय हिन्दी जानते हैं वह हिन्दी के प्रश्नों का उत्तर हिन्दी में दें ।

Mr. Speaker: I think I shall not be within constitutional limits to ask them to do it. They may do it of their own accord. I will never object to that; I may encourage that. But, I cannot ask them to reply in Hindi. There are a large number of Members who might feel that they can better understand in English.

श्री राधे लाल व्यास : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि चम्बल रिवर वैली योजना के खर्च के लिये, जिसको कि प्रान्तीय सरकार पूरा नहीं कर सकती है, प्रान्तीय सरकार ने केन्द्रीय सरकार से खर्चे की मांग की है, और यदि की है तो केन्द्रीय सरकार क्या उस प्रश्न पर विचार कर रही है ?

श्री सी० डी० देशमुख : सम्भव है कि वह अपने बल से इस योजना को पूरा न कर सकती हो । और यह सब प्रश्न नियोजन समिति के सामने हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Shri Sarangdhar Das: One question, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I have called the next question.

निषक्रमणार्थी संपत्ति

*१७८९. **सेठ गोविन्द दास** : क्या **पुनर्वास** मन्त्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि उस संपत्ति का कुल मूल्य क्या है, जिसका नियंत्रण सरकार ने निष्क्रमणार्थी संपत्ति के नाते अपने हाथ में लिया था, और जो बाद में उनके मालिकों को लौटा दी गयी ?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): Information regarding the total value of property, which, although treated at one time as evacuee property, was subsequently restored to

the owners, is not available. In order, however, to give some idea of the extent of restoration, I state the categories of persons to whom properties have been restored :

(1) Under a policy decision, properties have been restored to those persons who though declared evacuees had in fact never left India. Under this decision, property has been restored to:

(a) Meos of Matsya and Gurgaon numbering 1.07,500 (some of these Meos were resettled even though they had migrated to Pakistan and had subsequently returned before the introduction of permit system, 1,70,398 acres of agricultural land has been restored to them.

(b) Muslims of Ambala and Gurgaon district in the Punjab who had been displaced from their original homes but who continued to remain in India.

(c) Fortytwo persons to whom individual certificates of restoration were issued after due inquiry that though declared evacuees they had in fact not left India.

(2) Muslims who migrated from Uttar Pradesh during the period February to May, 1950. In their cases the Government of India agreed to resettlement and restoration of property after the Nehru-Liaquat Pact of April, 1950. The number of persons who have returned under this arrangement is 23,991.

(3) Persons whose cases are covered by Notification No. S.R.O. 260 dated 3-7-50 issued by the Government of India exempting certain classes of persons from being treated as evacuees under section 2(d)(i) of Act XXXI of 1950. There are four such cases of restoration.

(4) There have also been four other cases, three of them relating to foreigners, in which restoration of property has been made. The value of the property restored to them is Rs. 8,73,600.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या में एक प्रार्थना आपसे और कर सकता हूं कि जो प्रश्न हिन्दी में जावें वे इस लिस्ट में कम से कम हिन्दी में छपें और इसमें यह न लिखा जाय : "Original notice of the question received in Hindi " अंग्रेजी में भी छपें इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, लेकिन जब मूल प्रश्न हिन्दी में जाता है तो मूल सूची में उसका हिन्दी में ही छपना आवश्यक है ऐसा में मानता हूं ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I will invite the attention of the hon. Member to the Question list as distributed. On account of certain printing difficulties with the Press of the Government of India, it has not been possible to print the original questions in Hindi. Therefore, they are cyclostyled and these are supplied along with the English Questions. The hon. Member knows they are always circulated.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मुझे तो कभी नहीं मिलता, अध्यक्ष महोदय ।

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry if that is the particular misfortune of the hon. Member.

Some Hon. Members: It is not received.

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no talk like that. I merely say for the information of the hon. Member that they are being circulated as a matter of fact. Well, it is possible that in some cases, due to the slip of the persons who arrange distribution of papers, some papers might not have been included in the list.

Some Hon. Members: They are not circulated.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to go by what my Secretary says, that all papers to be distributed are put into the various pigeon holes for each Member. Hon. Members might inquire. There is no use of merely saying that they are not circulated to them.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I have not received......

Mr. Speaker: They will enquire. I will also enquire. That is the only way in which we can meet the demand. Those who are really interested in having the original question in Hindi, may better make a request and get the papers.

Shri K. K. Basu: That would help the Members to learn Hindi.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the request or the suggestion is made in all earnestness. For learning Hindi, there are other methods.

Shri Veeraswamy: I want to know the intention of certain hon. Members who speak in Hindi, put questions in Hindi and also insist on their questions being printed in Hindi.

Mr. Speaker: This question has been discussed very often. The hon. Member need not take the time of the House on this. Let us go to the next question.

RESTRICTION ON IMPORTS

***1790. Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government are contemplating a measure by which to restrict the imports of such articles as are manufactured in India;

(b) what is the process by which the proposed restrictions are to be imposed, and

(c) what are the articles that are in view of the Government for such treatment?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Is the Government contemplating to put any restriction on the quantity of imports?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I do not know what the hon. Member has in mind. If the hon. Member has in mind that the import policy of the Government is so utilised as to confer positive protection to certain industries that claim that they are manufacturing those articles in this country, I can say that that is not the policy of the Government. In framing the import policy, Government do take into account the availability of a particular class of goods, the extent of the goods that are available and frame their policy. No specific demand from an industry in respect of an indirect protection of that nature is entertained by the Government.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Has the Government received any representation or complaint that the protection is not being properly used in certain cases?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The question apparently has been switched on from import control to protection. If the hon. Member has any specific instance in view, and puts down a question, I shall attempt to answer.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Do Government contemplate any steps to restrict the import of foreign capital for manufacturing industries which ruin indigenous industries in India?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I quite concede that capital is also a form of goods; but it does not fit into this particular question.

Shri K. K. Basu: Is the Government aware of a statement that came out in the Press that even the Kriloskar industries had to close down for three months, being unable to compete with similar imported goods?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not aware.

Mr. Speaker: The question-hour is over.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

SUBSTITUTES FOR JUTE BAGS AND GUNNIES

***1791. Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the substitutes now in use for jute bags and gunnies;

(b) how far these can and have been able to compete with Indian jute products in price and quality; and

(c) what countries have been manufacturing and mostly using these substitutes?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Paper bags, cotton bags, and products of some other fibres similar to jute.

(b) Paper bags being the cheapest have made much headway in U.S.A. Jute bags are however once again cheap and they have an advantage over both paper bags and cotton bags from the point of view re-use value. The indications are that the consumption of jute goods will increase again.

(c) Paper bags and cotton bags are mostly manufactured and used in the U.S.A. Bags from substitute fibres like Kanaf Congo jute and Stockroo are manufactured and used mostly in Europe, South America and South Africa.

CONFERENCE ON RIVER VALLEY PROJECTS IN WASHINGTON

***1792. Shri L. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a conference of experts in flood control and irrigation was held recently in Washington in which India also took part;

(b) if so, by whom was India represented;

(c) the subjects of discussion with reference to Indian river valley projects;

(d) whether the question of control of Kosi River was also discussed there; and

(e) if so, the reaction of the conference on the said scheme?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The hon. Member is presumably referring to the meetings held in Washington from 7th May 1952 at the Headquarters of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which were attended by Engineers from India and Pakistan together with the Bank Engineers.

(b) Shri A. N. Khosla, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research.

(c) The study of possible technical measures to increase the supplies of water available from the Indus System of rivers for purposes of economic development.

(d) No.

(e) Does not arise.

MUSLIM PILGRIMS IN INDIA

***1793. Shri Ganpati Ram:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a body of 58 Muslim pilgrims from Pakistan arrived at Panipat;

(b) if so, on what terms they were permitted to come to India; and

(c) whether there was any arrangement made for their journey by the Government of India and if so, in what way?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) Presumably the hon. Member is referring to the party of 68 Muslim pilgrims from Pakistan which visited Panipat in June, 1952.

(b) The pilgrims were given a collective permit for entry into India *via* Hussainiwala and travelled under Police escort by the Hussainiwala-Ferozepore Ludhiana-Ambala-Karnal Panipat route and back.

(c) The Punjab (India) Government arranged the police escort and made arrangements also for protection of the party during their stay at Panipat. Food was provided on payment.

POWER ALCOHOL

***1794. Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any sugar factory in Madras which produce power alcohol; and

(b) what would be the productive capacity of all the sugar mills in India for producing power alcohol?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Sugar mills do not produce power alcohol. It is produced in distilleries. Their total installed capacity for power alcohol amounts to about 12·7 million gallons per annum.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF FILM ENQUIRY COMMITTEE

***1795. Shri N. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state the steps taken to implement the recommendations of the Film Enquiry Committee relating to 'Reforms' of the film industry?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): The recommendation of the Enquiry Committee are under active consideration of Government.

PAKISTANI RAIDS

***1796. Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether within the last three weeks Government had any reports of raids by armed forces of East Bengal into Indian territory;

(b) if so, (i) their number,

(ii) the places where the raids took place, and

(iii) the casualties in the raids; and

(c) whether there have been any raids into Indian territory by private individuals from East Bengal?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra):

(a) Yes.

(b) (i) There were ten such incidents reported during the period from 15th May to 15th June 1952, six on the West Bengal border and four on the Assam border.

(ii) Nadia, West Dinajpur, Murshidabad, and Malda districts of West Bengal and Goalpara, Cachar and K. and J. Hills districts of Assam.

(iii) There were no casualties.

(c) Yes: There were two such incidents in Malda and Murshidabad districts of West Bengal.

PROPERTIES REQUISITIONED AND ACQUIRED

*1797. **Shri Vidyalankar:** Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of properties requisitioned and acquired up to date under the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952 within Delhi and New Delhi Municipal Areas;

(b) whether any of these properties have been requisitioned for non-Governmental purposes and given to private individuals or corporations;

(c) if so, the names of such persons and organisations; and

(d) whether it is a fact that Government have received a number of complaints that certain requisitioned houses remain unoccupied for a long time, and still they are not returned to the owners?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) The number of properties requisitioned and acquired are as follows:

	Requisitioned	Acquired
New Delhi	1	Nil
Old Delhi	16	Nil

(b) No; Sir,

(c) Does not arise.

(d) No; Sir.

WORK-CHARGED ESTABLISHMENT ON RIVER VALLEY PROJECTS

*1798. **Shri Vidyalankar:** Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of work charged establishment employed in:—

(i) Damodar Valley Project,

(ii) Bhakhra Nangal, and

(iii) Hirakud Project;

(b) the number of quarters provided by Government to the workers of the work charged establishment at each of the abovementioned projects; and

(c) what steps Government propose to take for providing sufficient number of quarters for the workers?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as available.

ABDUCTED WOMEN

*1799. **Shri Dhusiya:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) the latest number of abducted women recovered from Pakistan who have been brought to India;

(b) how many out of them have been married or remarried and what assistance, if any, they are getting in this matter from Government; and

(c) the main sources of such recovered women as are unattached to earn their bread?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) 8,206 up to the 30th June, 1952.

(b) and (c). Government have no machinery for arranging matrimonial alliances for recovered persons. Soon after recovery, most of the recovered persons are restored to their original families. The remaining few, whose relatives are not traceable, are sent to Rehabilitation Homes run by the various State Governments, where they are treated in the same way as other refugee women and are helped to rehabilitate according to their individual inclination.

INDIAN TEA

*1800. **Shri Bhagwat Jha:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Indian tea has lost ground in countries like Australia and New Zealand;

(b) if so, whether Government have set up any Enquiry Committee for the investigation into the causes therefor, and

(c) what further action or actions Government propose to take to win back such lost markets?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) During recent months our exports show a fall.

(b) No, Sir.

(c). The matter is under consideration.

BLAST FURNACES

*1801. **Shri Bhagwat Jha:** Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) what steps are being taken by Government to start their own proposed blast furnaces either in Orissa or in Madhya Pradesh;

(b) how far the work has been completed and when Government expect to start it;

(c) the estimated cost of construction; and

(d) the estimated produce from such furnaces per year?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) and (b). Negotiations are in progress for the setting up of the necessary plant but it is not possible to say at present when the project will materialize or where it will be located.

(c) and (d). Final details have not yet been worked out.

PIG IRON FACTORY

***1802. Shri Bhagwat Jha**: Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that an offer was received from Japan to invest a certain per cent of the total cost in the construction of a pig iron factory in India;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Government of India proposed to set up a delegation to visit Japan to explore the possibilities of the same; and

(c) if so, whether the delegation has started working and what is the progress of the work?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) Yes;

(b) Yes;

(c) No; negotiations are still going on through the Indian Embassy in Tokyo.

STUDY OF COTTAGE INDUSTRY IN JAPAN

***1803. Shri B. N. Roy**: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether there is any proposal by Government to send some Indians to Japan for special study in Cottage Industry?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): No, Sir.

AMERICAN AND BRITISH INTEREST IN INDIAN OIL REFINERIES

***1804. Shri Krishna Chandra**: Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of India guaranteed American and British private interests against nationalisation of their projected oil refineries for a period of twenty-five years;

(b) whether any of these refineries have started work;

(c) if so, what quantity has been produced upto May 31, 1952;

(d) whether any formal agreements have been made with these firms; and

(e) if so, what their terms are?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise;

(d) No formal agreements have been executed but the proposals received from the Standard Vacuum Oil Company of New York and from the Burmah-Shell group of London were accepted by mutual exchange of letters;

(e) The main terms of the proposals accepted by Government have been published already in Press Notes dated 30th November 1951 and 15th December 1951.

HINDU SWEEPERS IN PAKISTAN

***1805. Shri Balmiki**: Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that Hindu sweepers are still left in West Pakistan;

(b) if so, their approximate number;

(c) how many of them have come to India on leave during 1951-52 to their villages;

(d) how many of them have been challanned on refusing to go to Pakistan;

(e) whether it is a fact that Hindu sweepers who are residents of India are compelled to go to Pakistan; and

(f) if so, reasons therefor?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes.

(b) Approximately 74,000.

(c) As no separate statistics castewise are kept, it is not possible to give this information.

(d) and (e). No separate statistics caste-wise and community-wise are kept of persons prosecuted under Influx from Pakistan Act. But, it is highly unlikely that a Hindu sweeper who may have come from Pakistan on a temporary permit may have been prosecuted and forced to return to Pakistan.

(f) Does not arise.

STEEL PRODUCING CENTRE IN BIHAR

*1806. **Shri G. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there was any expert report favouring location of a Steel Production Centre in Bihar; and

(b) the total amount of steel imported in 1951 and 1952?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) The three Steel Consultants appointed by the Government of India in 1948 to survey the possibilities of erecting new steel plants in India, considered several sites in Bihar, but did not recommend the location of a new steel plant in that State.

(b) 177.649 tons in 1951 and 102.875 tons upto 30th June. 1952.

WORKING PARTIES FOR ENGINEERING AND TEXTILE INDUSTRIES

*1807. **Shri Bansal:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of India appointed Working Parties for heavy engineering industries and cotton textiles in accordance with the recommendations made by the Standing Committee of the Central Advisory Council of Industries;

(b) if so, whether the Working Parties on heavy engineering industries and the cotton textile industry have submitted their reports to Government;

(c) if so, the main recommendations of the Working Parties; and

(d) whether the same have been examined by Government?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Working Party for Heavy Engineering industries has submitted its report, while the report of Working Party for Cotton Textiles industry is still awaited.

(c) A list of the main recommendations made by the Working Party for Heavy Engineering Industry is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 46.]

(d) Yes.

DRINKING WATER IN COAL MINES

*1808. **Shri R. B. Shah:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is always acute shortage of drinking water in the coal mines of Chhindwara District of Madhya Pradesh on account of which there is great discontentment in labour quarters;

(b) whether it is a fact that in 1945 Government deputed Mr. Berry, a Civil Engineer, to survey a scheme of water supply in Perch Coal Field Area, who submitted his detailed report suggesting construction of a Dam across the Perch River; and

(c) if so why water supply problem is still not solved?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) There is shortage of water in the coal mines of Chhindwara District in summer. There is, however, no information that the shortage is acute or that it exists always or that there is great discontentment in labour quarters on this score.

(b) Yes.

(c) In view of the excessive cost involved in the execution of the scheme, the Central Government had to drop it. Steps are being taken to request the State Government to set up a Water Board on the lines of Jharia Water Board. When this Board is set up, the situation is likely to improve.

स्लेट

*१८०९. **श्री आर० एस० तिवारी :** क्या **वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री** यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे :

(क) भारत में उन स्थानों के नाम जहां पर स्लेट के कारखाने हैं ;

(ख) उन स्थानों के नाम, जहां स्लेट का पत्थर मिलता है ;

(ग) क्या स्लेट का भारत से बाहर निर्यात होता है ; और

(घ) यदि होता है तो कितनी मात्रा में ?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Out of about 200 slate factories scattered in the country, 152 are situated in the State of Madras (mainly in Markapur, Cumbum and Gojjalakonda), 5 in Bombay (Bijapur District) 5 in PEPSU (Ateli), 28 in Punjab (Kund) and 16 in Delhi.

(b) Mostly in the Kurnool District in Madras and the Kangra Valley.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) Export figures for slate are not recorded separately in Trade Accounts.

NAGPUR AND AURANGABAD RADIO STATIONS

***1810. Shri K. G. Deshmukh:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) what is the K.W. strength of the transmitters fixed at Nagpur and Aurangabad Radio Stations respectively; and

(b) whether it is a fact that a transmitter of 50 K.W. strength is going to be fixed at Nagpur Radio Station in the near future?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) Nagpur and Aurangabad have 1 K.W. and half a K.W. medium-wave transmitters respectively.

(b) No, Sir. A 10 K.W. medium-wave transmitter is under installation at Nagpur.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS IN MADHYA PRADESH

***1811. Shri K. G. Deshmukh:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) at how many centres the work in connection with Community Projects, under Ford Foundation Scheme, has been started up till now in Madhya Pradesh;

(b) what area comes under "Amravati Centre" in Madhya Pradesh;

(c) the progress made at Amravati Centre, under this Scheme; and

(d) the total amount sanctioned for the Amravati Centre towards the expenditure for the operation of this Scheme?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) One.

(b) A rural community project of the basic type under the Indo-U.S. Technical Corporation **Agreement has been allotted in the Amravati District** in Madhya Pradesh. The area is 525 sq. miles, situated down the hills, separating the Amravati District from Betul and Chhindwara districts and in the plains of the Purna river in Morsi and Daryapur Tahsils.

(c) Work in the project area is to begin by 1st October 1952.

(d) The estimated expenditure on a rural community project basic type, is Rs. 65 lakhs for a period of 3 years.

FOREIGN CAPITAL IN PAPER MILLS

***1812. Shri K. G. Deshmukh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state how much foreign capital is invested in the paper mills in India?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Approximately Rs. 119 lakhs up to 30-6-1948. Later figures are not available.

IMMIGRANTS (EXPULSION FROM ASSAM) ACT

***1813. Babu Ram Narayan Singh:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) how long the Immigrants (Expulsion from Assam) Act No. X of 1950 has been administered and since when;

(b) the number of Immigrants dealt with by this Act and with what result;

(c) the procedure followed in the administration of this Act;

(d) the machinery by which this Act was administered; and

(e) The expenditure incurred till 31st March, 1952?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) The Immigrants (Expulsion from Assam) Act No. X of 1950 which came into force on the 1st March 1950, was proceeded by the Immigrants (Expulsion from Assam) Ordinance, 1950. The Ordinance was in force from the 6th January to the 1st March and the Act from the 1st March to the 8th April, 1950. Under the Prime Ministers' Agreement of the 8th April, 1950, it was decided that the Act should be kept in abeyance.

(b) The number of Immigrants expelled from Assam under the Ordinance and the Act is 354. Some persons who returned to Assam were arrested and prosecuted. The **exact number of such persons cannot be ascertained.**

(c) On receipt of a police report showing sufficient grounds against any person justifying expulsion, the District Magistrate or Sub-Divisional Magistrate is empowered to pass an order of expulsion. The Act requires the person expelled to be escorted to the border of Assam.

(d) No special machinery has been set up to administer the Act. District and Sub-Divisional Magistrates are empowered to take action.

(e) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

FACT FINDING COMMITTEE

***1814. Shri K. C. Sodhia:** Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the report of the Fact Finding Committee, set up to investigate into the question of surplus labour in Railway Collieries has been received by Government and if so, what are its main recommendations;

(b) how much time Government propose to take for the consideration of their report; and

(c) whether Government propose to publish this report?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) Not yet.

(b) It is not possible to fix any time limit, but consideration of the Report after it is received will be expedited.

(c) The suggestions will be considered after the report has been received by Government.

PRINTING EXPERT

***1815. Shri K. C. Sodhia:** Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the printing expert available under the Colombo Plan has started working with the Government of India;

(b) the duration of his appointment and the terms of his service; and

(c) whether Government propose amalgamation of any of their printing presses and if so, which?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government of India have obtained the services of the Printing Expert for a period of two years; the United Kingdom Government will meet the cost of basic pay, overseas allowance, equipment allowance and expenditure during the voyage of the expert. In addition, the expert will receive from the Government of India certain facilities and allowances, the details of which are given in a statement laid on the Table. [See Appendix VIII, annexure No. 47].

(c) It is proposed to attach the Government of India Photo Litho Press at Queensway, but as a separate wing, to the Government of India Press, New Delhi, after the extension of the Press building has been completed.

TYPE-WRITERS

***1816. Shri K. C. Sodhia:** Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) the total average annual expenditure of the last three years on purchase of type-writers in all the offices of the Government of India;

(b) what Indian firms manufacture type-writers and what is their annual output; and

(c) how much of the Government purchase consisted of (i) Indian manufacture and (ii) foreign manufactures of these type-writers?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) Rs. 10,41,775/-.

(b) There are no Indian firms which manufacture typewriters. The question of their output therefore does not arise.

(c) (i) Nil.

(ii) 4,329 typewriters of foreign manufacture were purchased during the last three years.

PRESS REPRESENTATIVES WITH CULTURAL DELEGATION TO CHINA

***1817. Shri B. S. Murthy:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any press representative was sent at Government cost to China along with the Indian Cultural Mission to China; and

(b) if the answer to part (a) above is in the affirmative, the amount spent on him by Government?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). No one was sent at Government cost as a press representative to China with the Indian Cultural Delegation. A representative of the Press Trust of India accompanied the delegation, but this was not at Government expense.

Two representatives of the Indian Press were members of the Indian Cultural Mission to China. They went as delegates and not as press representatives.

RAMAPADA SAGARA PROJECT

***1818. Shri B. S. Murthy:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Ramapada Sagara Project will be included in the Five Year Plan; and

(b) the estimated cost for this project and the area to be served?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The matter is under examination by a technical committee and the decision must await their report.

(b) The estimated cost of the Project is Rs. 129 crores and the area to be served will be 23·96 lakhs acres.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

***1819. Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is, or is going to be appointed, a Central Committee to administer the Community Projects; and

(b) if so, the composition of the said Committee?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) and (b). The Planning Commission has been designated as the Central Committee for the purpose of supervising the administration of the Community Projects.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES FOR A. I. R. STATIONS

***1820. Shri Madiah Gowda:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state.

(a) whether advisory committees have been formed for each of the A.I.R. Stations;

(b) what powers and functions are assigned to these committees; and

(c) how often they meet in a year?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) Programme Advisory Committees have been constituted for all stations of All India Radio.

Rural Advisory Committees have been constituted at 12 Stations and are in process of being formed at 7 more Stations.

(b) The functions of the Programme Advisory Committees are to keep the Director-General in touch with local public opinion in the matter of programme construction and to advise the Station Director on various aspects of planning and presentation of programmes.

(c) About once a quarter.

TYPEWRITERS AND CALCULATING MACHINES

***1821. Shri M. Islamuddin:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the number and value of typewriters and calculating machines imported from America during the last three years;

(b) the number and value of Remington Typewriters imported from the United Kingdom;

(c) the amount saved by Government by purchase of Remington Typewriters from Remington Rand Inc. India as agents of Remington Rand Company of U.K.; and

(d) whether duplicators and calculating and accounting machines are being manufactured in India and if so, to what extent?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 48.]

Information in respect of calculating machines is not readily available.

(b) Information about imports of particular brands or makes of typewriters is not readily available.

(c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 49.]

(d) Only duplicators are being manufactured in India. 1560 were manufactured in 1951 and 383 up to June, 1952.

LEASING OF LAND IN FARIDABAD COLONY

***1822. Shri Punnoose:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are leasing out land in Faridabad Colony for industrial purposes and if so, on what conditions;

(b) how much of such land has already been leased out and the number of industrialists who have availed of it;

(c) what quantity of electricity produced at Faridabad is being consumed by the Colony; and

(d) the number of houses built after the date on which the Government of India took charge of the Colony and the conditions on which they are given to displaced persons?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes. A statement giving the conditions of lease is laid on the Table. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 50.]

(b) 113.44 acres have been leased out to 23 private industries.

(c). 500 k.w.

(d) The total number of houses built so far is 5.156. The houses are allotted to the registered displaced persons of the townships on a hire-purchase basis at a monthly instalment of Rs. 11/14/- for each house for a period of 30 years. On account of poor economic conditions of the displaced persons, they are being charged at present at the rate of Rs. 6 per month.

FRUITS EXPORTED TO PAKISTAN

***1823. Shri B. S. Murthy:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the money value and the various categories of fruits exported to Pakistan during 1950-51 and 1951-52:

(b) the duty, if any, imposed by the Pakistan Government and the rate thereof; and

(c) the approximate loss suffered by the exporters due to custom delays?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). A statement containing the information is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 51.]

(c) Government are not aware of any delays in the clearance of fruits for export to Pakistan causing loss to exporters.

CLOTH PRICES

***1824. Shri M. Islamuddin:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether the cloth prices for the quarter July—September have been revised and if so, what is the result of the revision?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Yes. There has been an increase in the prices of coarse cloth by 5.55 per cent. to 6.75 per cent. and also in the prices of fine cloth by 8:9 per cent. to 11.0 per cent In the case of medium and superfine cloth, however, there has been decrease of 0.63 per cent. to 1.58 per cent. and 8.3 per cent. to 13.8 per cent. respectively, over the previous prices. A copy of the Notification issued by the Textile Commissioner is laid on the Table of the House. [Copy placed in the Library. *See* No. P-58/52.]

MACHKUND PROJECT

***1825. Shri Sanganna:** Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of India have any control over the working of the Machkund Hydraulic project in the District of Koraput (Orissa); and

(b) if so, what is the nature of control?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

DUTIES ON TEA

***1826. Shri Muniswamy:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any representation from the members of the Central Tea Board of India regarding the Export and Excise duties on tea: and

(b) if so, what action has been taken in the matter?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The recommendations of the Central Tea Board will be considered in the light of the report of the Special Committee appointed to investigate into the problems of the tea industry.

RIVER VALLEY PROJECTS IN ASSAM

***1827. Shri Beli Ram Das:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any river valley projects are under contemplation of Government in respect of the rivers of Assam;

(b) whether any survey has been made in this respect: and

(c) what are the results?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). Discharge and silt observations are being carried out at present.

GLASS BOTTLES (IMPORT)

*1828. **Dr. Amin:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether import licences are being issued for the import of empty glass bottles like aerated water bottles and milk bottles;

(b) if the answer to part (a) above is in the affirmative, the total value of such licences issued during the periods July—December, 1951, January—June, 1952 and July—December, 1952 and the reason for the same; and

(c) the total amount of foreign exchange spent on the import of empty glass bottles during these periods?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The total value of the Licences issued is as follows:—

July-December, 1951	...	Rs. 276,191
January-June 1952	..	Rs. 6,17,761
July-December, 1952	..	So far no licences have been issued.

Licences were issued for the import of special types of glass bottles not made in the country in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements of actual users.

(c) The total value of imports of empty glass bottles during the period 1st July 1951 to May 1952, is Rs. 11.46 lakhs. (Figures for the month of June 1952 are not available yet.)

IRON AND TIN SHEETS FOR MADRAS STATE

*1829. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the quarterly quota of iron and of tin sheets allotted for Madras State during 1950, 1951 and 1952;

(b) whether there has been any reduction in the quota from quarter to quarter, and if so for what reasons;

(c) whether any allocation is sanctioned for cottage industries producing 'Panchamritam' tins in and around Palni, Madras State; and

(d) if answer to part (c) above be in the affirmative, what is the total so allocated and whether there has been any reduction in this for the last three years, if so why?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 52.]

(b) Yes, in the case of Pig Iron on account of reduction in the quantity available for distribution.

(c) and (d). The information is not readily available.

ZIP MANUFACTURE

*1830. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Zip manufacturers in India manufacturing Zip fasteners and allied goods and the names of these factories;

(b) whether it is a fact that Messrs. Link Industries Ltd., Madras is the only major concern in India in the line of manufacture;

(c) whether the inclusion of zip fasteners for protection in the Tariff Amendment Bill of 1952 was made on the application or representations of the Link Industries Ltd. to Government;

(d) whether any inquiry was conducted by the Tariff Board into the need for protection of this Industry; and

(e) if the answer to part (d) be in the affirmative whether inquiry was conducted before the inclusion of the Industry in the Tariff Amendment Bill and what were the recommendations of the Tariff Board?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). M/s. Link Industries Ltd., Madras, are the only manufacturers of Zip Fasteners in India at present.

(c) No, Sir. The inclusion was made on the recommendation of the late Indian Tariff Board which conducted an enquiry into the industry.

(d) Yes, Sir.

(e) The enquiry was conducted before the inclusion of the Industry in the Tariff Amendment Bill. The recommendations of the Tariff Board are embodied in the Government Resolution, copy of which is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 53.]

ACCIDENT IN SINGARANI COLLIERIES

*1831. **Shri Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the causes for the accident on 22nd June, 1952 in Incline No. 2, **Singarani** Collieries, Kothagudium;

(b) the number of miners injured and killed; and

(c) whether any enquiry official or non-official was held; if so, the findings of such enquiry?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House in due course.

EMPLOYMENT OF SKILLED WORKERS AND ARTISANS

*1832. **Shri Badshah Gupta**: Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state whether Employment Exchanges secure employment for skilled factory workers and artisans?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): Yes, Sir.

MINIMUM WAGES ACT (IMPLEMENTATION)

428. **Dr. Satyawadi**: Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to lay a statement on the Table of the House showing the progress made by the various States regarding the implementation of the Minimum Wages Act for the inferior subordinate employees under the local authorities?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 54.]

COAL SHORTAGE

429. **Shri Ganpati Ram**: Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state whether it is a fact that shortage of wagons is the main reason for the non-availability of coal in various Eastern districts of Uttar Pradesh for well construction and building purposes?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): Yes, combined with difficulties of transhipment at Mokamehghat

RUBBER GOODS

430. **Shri Badshah Gupta**: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the names of rubber goods with their respective values in terms of rupees imported during 1951-52 from different countries; and

(b) the names of places in India where the rubber goods of the variety mentioned in part (a) above are manufactured?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) only such types and sizes of rubber goods as are not made in India are allowed to be imported. A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 55.]

(b) Bombay, Calcutta and Madras.

LABOUR UNIONS

431. **Shri Pateria**: Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of Labour Unions in the country upto March 1952 and their respective strength of members;

(b) the number of Unions affiliated to (i) Socialist Party; (ii) Communist Party; (iii) I.N.T.U.C.; and (iv) Independents;

(c) whether there is any arrangement in the country for training labour leaders; and

(d) how many Agricultural Labour Unions have been registered so far?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) 2,853, according to the figures for 1950-51, which are provisional. Figures for 1951-52 are not yet available.

(b) Information regarding the affiliations of Unions is not being collected and hence not available.

(c) A list of institutions where training is available is attached. [*See* Appendix VIII; annexure No. 56.]

(d) 90, according to the figures for 1950-51, which are provisional. Information for 1951-52 is not yet available.

DELHI EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGE

432. **Shri Ajit Singh**: Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state:

(a) how many persons got themselves registered in the Employment Exchange in Delhi in 1952 under (i) skilled (ii) semi-skilled and (iii) unskilled categories and out of them how many have been provided with jobs in each category; and

(b) how much expenditure is being incurred on this Exchange (i) recurring (ii) non-recurring and (iii) on peons, clerks, assistants and officers separately?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a).—

Category	*No. registered during Jan.,—May,' 52.*	*No. placed in employment during the same period.*
(1) Skilled and semi-skilled technicians.	4,910	711
(2) Unskilled workers	11,158	2,134

(b) The average monthly expenditure. is as follows:—

(i) recurring	Rs. 12,140/-
(ii) non-recurring	Rs. 200/-
(iii) on Peons	Rs. 1,008/-
Clerks	Rs. 3,997/-
Assistants	Rs. 390/-
Officers	Rs. 3,480-

RENT CONTROL

433. Shri Radha Raman: Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) how many cases of rent control were filed with the Rent Controller during 1950-51 and 1951-52;

(b) how many of them could be disposed of during each of the above years;

(c) in how many cases rent was fixed lower than that fixed previously; and

(d) how many of these cases went on appeal and with what results?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a)—

1950-51	305
1951-52	351

(b) 320 cases were disposed of during 1950-51, of which 93 were those filed during that year. 317 cases were disposed of during 1951-52, of which 173 were those filed in 1950-51 and 132 in 1951-52.

(c) The exact number is not available but I understand that in most the rent fixed was lower than that charged by the landlord previously.

(d) Out of the cases registered and disposed of during 1950-51 and 1951-52 175 cases went on appeal with the following results:—

(i) Number of cases in which the decision of the Rent Controller were upheld	25
(ii) Number of cases in which the decisions of the Rent Controller were set aside.	7
(iii) Cases sent back for fresh hearing	5
(iv) Cases in which the decisions of the Rent Controller were modified	3
(v) Results of appeals not yet known.	135
Total	175

TRADE DELEGATION FROM AUSTRALIA

434. Shri B. S. Murthy: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any Trade Delegation from Australia has come to India for trade negotiations; and

(b) the items to be discussed?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Bidis AND CIGARETTES

435. Shri M. Islamuddin: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity and value of *Bidis* manufactured in India;

(b) the quantity and value of *Bidis* exported; and

(c) the quantity and value of cigarettes and cigars imported?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) On a rough estimate about 126,667 million (number) *Bidis* valued at about Rs. 63,33,35,000 are manufactured in India every year.

(b) Figures of exports of *Bidis* are not available.

(c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 58.]

STAFF ARTISTES OF A. I. R.

436. Shri K. Subrahmanyam: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) how many staff artistes are employed by the All India Radio;

(b) what are their conditions of service, scales of pay etc. and whether they are treated as full-fledged Government employees;

(c) whether their jobs are permanent, or are they employed on a contract basis for fixed periods renewable after the expiry of the same;

(d) whether the staff artistes are entitled to medical and other benefits; and

(e) whether they are entitled to Government accommodation?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) The number of staff artists employed on 30th June 1952 was 840.

(b) The staff artists of All India Radio are whole time employees of Government. They are engaged on a contract basis and are paid a monthly remuneration. But as the nature of their work does not easily fit into the normal pattern of Government service, they are governed by special rules regarding recruitment, remuneration, increments, leave, travelling allowance and gratuity etc.

The monthly remuneration of a staff artist is fixed after taking into account all relevant factors such as merit, suitability and general availability of talent for the work for which the person concerned is appointed. No uniform scale of pay can be applied to staff artists as the availability of talent and the merits of artists vary from place to place and from individual to individual.

(c) They are employed on a contract basis normally for a period of three years (in special cases for a shorter period). The contracts are renewable for further periods of 3 years or less according to the requirements of All India Radio.

(d) Yes.

(e) No.

RESCUE STATIONS

437. **Shri B. S. Murthy:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Rescue Stations in South India as per Indian Coal Mines Rescue Rules, 1939;

(b) the total number of persons who received benefit due to Rescue Stations during 1951-52; and

(c) the total expenditure incurred on the Rescue Stations during 1951-52?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) None; the rules apply only to the Jharia and Raniganj coalfields.

(b) and (c). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House in due course.

CASTOR OIL (EXPORT)

438. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the amount and value of exports of crude and refined castor oil during the years 1948 to 1952;

(b) the countries to which they are exported;

(c) the names of the firms exporting them;

(d) how many of the above firms (c) are foreign owned and controlled; and

(e) whether export of caster oil has priority on shipping?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). A statement is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix VIII, annexure No. 58.]

(c) and (d). Accurate information in this regard is not available.

(e) There are no priorities in shipping.

PIT-HEAD BATHS IN COLLIERIES

439. **Shri Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) how many pit-head baths are there in coal mines at Kothagudiam and Bellampalli;

(b) how many are proposed to be constructed; and

(c) the total amount allocated for the construction of pit-head baths for the year 1952-53?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) None; a few, however, are under construction.

(b) Under the Rules, five pit-head baths are required to be constructed.

(c) It is the responsibility of colliery owners to provide pit-head baths at their own cost. The Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund however pay a subsidy equal to 10 per cent. of the cost of construction subject to certain ceiling limits, if the baths are completed and put in commission to the satisfaction of the Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner by the 12th November 1952.

MIGRANTS (SCHEDULED CASTES AND TRIBES)

440. **Shri Rup Narain:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) how many members of Scheduled Castes and Tribes have migrated to India from Pakistan;

(b) what is the total amount spent for their rehabilitation by the Government;

(c) the number of houses built for the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes Refugees; and

(d) whether any colony has been established for them separately?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Information has not yet been compiled by the Registrar General, India.

(b) Separate figures of expenditure incurred exclusively on the rehabilitation of scheduled castes and tribes are not available.

(c) About 2,000 houses have been built exclusively for these classes of displaced persons but they are also entitled to allotment under general housing schemes like other displaced persons.

(d) Yes.

DISPLACED STUDENTS (SCHOLARSHIPS AND STIPENDS)

441. **Shri Rup Narain:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) what amounts have been spent, if any, for awarding scholarships and stipends to displaced students for their studies in High Schools and Colleges in different States in 1951-52 and what amount is proposed to be spent during the current year;

(b) how many students have benefited by the scheme; and

(c) whether there is any contribution to these amounts by the State Governments?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) and (b). A sum of Rs. 1,33,57,000 has been allotted to the various States for the current financial year. The rest of the information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

(c) No.

ACCIDENT IN KOLAR GOLD MINES

422. **Shri Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the cause of the accident that occured in the Champion Reef Mine of the Kolar Gold Fields on the 1st July, 1952;

(b) the total number of persons killed and injured in the accident;

(c) the number of accidents in the Kolar Gold Fields mines since 1947 with dates and number of casualties;

(d) what precautions are taken in order to prevent these accidents;

(e) what was the result of the enquiry, which according to the Minister of Labour, was being carried out after the accident on the 19th April, 1952; and

(f) whether Government propose to place the report of the enquiry on the Table of the House?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) The accident happened as a result of a heavy rockburst.

(b) Two persons are seriously injured and nine are missing.

(c) The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House in due course.

(d) As a result of the inquiry made into the cause of accident which occured on the 2nd November 1951, the Inspector of Mines, Oorgaum has made certain recommendations, specifying the manner in which support should be set and advanced in the levels where faults are known to exist, to be implemented by mine managements. He also had a discussion with the Superintendents of all mines on further precautionary measures. The Department of Mines are presently studying the nature and occurrence of rockburst in Kolar Gold Fields which took place during the past 25 years with a view to formulating measures to prevent recurrence of such rockbursts. The question of appointing a Court of Inquiry to go into the question of the rockburst of the 19th April 1952 is being considered and its findings might help the Government to decide what further precautionary measures should be taken. All possible attention is being paid to the enforcement of the Mines Act, 1952 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

(e) The Inspector, who conducted the enquiry, was of the opinion that the rockburst could not have been foreseen and that all possible precautionary measures had been taken by the mine management.

(f) I would invite the attention of my friend to the reply given by me today to part (d) of the Starred Question No. 1785.

Dated......20.11.2014...

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 16th July, 1952.

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(*See Part I*)

9-15 A.M.

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

USE OF FORCE BY POLICE IN CALCUTTA

Mr. Speaker: I have received notices of three adjournment motions. One is from the hon. Member Shri Gurupadaswamy. He wants adjournment of the House to discuss "the use of force, lathi and tear gas by the police of Calcutta on Tuesday, the 15th of July against the peaceful procession of citizens" which has caused, as he says, a grave threat etc. I need not discuss this. Obviously, it is not the concern of the Government of India. It is undoubtedly the concern of the West Bengal Government and I cannot give my consent to this.

FOOD POLICY *re* WEST BENGAL

Mr. Speaker: Then there are two adjournment motions practically dealing with the same subject. One is by the hon. Member Dr. Meghnad Saha and the other by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri. The first reads as follows:

> "The situation arising in west Bengal on account of the failure of the Government of India to take prompt and effective steps so as to get the new food policy with regard to West Bengal as announced by the hon. the Food Minister on the 13th of June last and reiterated on the floor of the House in the course of his reply to discussions on the Food Budget, implemented by the Government of West Bengal, leading to" etc.—with which we are not concerned—leading to, as he says, "public agitation and civil disobedience movement in the State".

The second, from Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, reads:

> "The situation arising in West Bengal by the failure of the Government of India to take prompt and effective steps so as to ensure increased food supply for the Greater Calcutta industrial area and to get the new food policy with regard to West Bengal as announced by the hon. the Food Minister on the 13th of June, 1952, and again reiterated on the floor of the House during Budget discussions, implemented by the Government of West Bengal."

Now, I should like the hon. Members who have given notices of these adjournment motions just to tell, in a few words as to what specifically, according to them, is the failure to implement the policy and what exactly that policy was. They need not take a long time. I merely want to consider the admissibility of these motions.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): The new food policy announced by the hon. Mr. Kidwai with regard to West Bengal, particularly with regard to the Greater Calcutta industrial area was, briefly speaking, this: He announced that the Centre would undertake the responsibility of supplying the additional foodgrains—rice and wheat—that would be required to feed the Greater Calcutta industrial area and certain other measures would follow as a logical consequence to this policy. But it has been announced day before yesterday by the Chief Minister of the Government of West Bengal that they

[Shri T. K. Chaudhuri]

have not received any assurance from the Central Government that the additional foodgrains required would be supplied to them. As a matter of fact the Chief Minister of the Government of West Bengal came out with a lengthy statement and he also reproduced the copy of a telegram that he had sent to the hon. the Food Minister here. But we do not know what reply has been sent to that telegram of the Chief Minister of West Bengal. Now a great confusion has arisen in the public mind, and naturally panic has been created. I wanted some assurance from the hon. the Food Minister on the floor of the House during the course of the Budget discussions that the food policy with regard to West Bengal must be announced very clearly because there is a feeling amongst the public in West Bengal that the new policy which was announced with regard to West Bengal—not the larger policy with regard to control and decontrol—was not being implemented or there was some unwillingness on the part of the West Bengal Government to implement the hon. Mr. Kidwai's policy with regard to West Bengal. And he gave a categorical assurance that that policy would be implemented by this year and that the additional foodgrains required would be supplied. But now the Chief Minister of the Government of West Bengal has come out with a statement that the required additional foodgrains have not been supplied and that they are not in a position to implement that policy. Naturally, there is a great discontent.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member Dr. Saha wish to say anything?

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta North-West): No further elucidation is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to know the position of Government in this matter.

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): Government is keeping a careful watch on the developments with regard to Calcutta and West Bengal. The two undertakings which the hon. Minister of Food gave with regard to Calcutta are the following: The public will get, in addition to their usual rice ration at the ration shops at the controlled price, the sale of rice at fair price shops. The price of this rice is Rs. 30 a maund which of course is higher than the price of the rice allowed in the ration shops. Fair price shops have been started in Calcutta from July 7th, 1952, so that that part of the undertaking given by the Food Minister is being implemented.

The second undertaking which was given by the Food Minister was that the Government of India will give the West Bengal Government one lakh tons of rice. Out of this 44,000 tons has already been allotted. The House will realize that the transport of rice takes some time, and so far as it was possible steps have been taken to implement the second part of the undertaking as well.

These two motions refer particularly to Calcutta. The third undertaking given by the Food Minister was with regard to the Sunderbans and the Nadia districts. He promised that 15,000 tons will be allotted for these areas at the reduced rate of Rs. 15 per maund. That is, the Government of India will bear the difference in the actual cost, and the sale will be at the subsidised rate of Rs. 15 per maund. Now, 15,000 tons of rice has already been allotted, to be sold at the rate of Rs. 15 per maund.

So, I think, all that was possible has been done in this matter. The House will realize that the changeover in the food policy takes some time to implement and within the short time that has been available at the disposal of the Government of India every possible step has been taken to implement the scheme. Of course, the situation with regard to food in Bengal is a somewhat difficult one. But on the whole, ever since the Food Minister announced his policy there has been an easing of the situation, and the House and the hon. Member should have a little patience and see how the policy is being implemented. I believe, so far as my information goes, that the situation has not worsened. In fact, a very highly placed officer of the Government of India has gone to Calcutta to make assessment of the situation, to expedite the transport and otherwise expedite the implementation of the promises given by the Food Minister.

That is all the information that I have. As soon as that officer returns I think I shall be able to place more facts before the House.

Mr. Speaker: The information that the hon. Minister has given is, in a sense, too general. Could he be specific on certain points? A statement is made that the hon. the Chief Minister of West Bengal sent a wire to the Government of India. What specific reply has the Government sent to him? That would be one of the principal points on which there should be clarification. Then, how many shops are started. From what time they are started?

Shri A. P. Jain: The time I have given, Sir. I said from the 7th July.

Mr. Speaker: But how many shops? He said that arrangements are being made. Is any consignment despatched at all? He spoke of allotment of 44,000 maunds, but the allotment of one lakh of maunds is promised. How many maunds of rice have already left the areas from which the rice has to go to Bengal? If he gives specific information on these points, it will be possible for me to come to any conclusion as to how far the implementation has been there. The Chief complaint here is that certain promises were made, and they are not being implemented, and the hon. Minister will see that time is the essence of such things. If he can give that information, if not now, tomorrow, I shall be then able to consider this point of adjournment motion further.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): Would you allow me to refer to one point which has not been mentioned, but which I think is very important. The Chief Minister of West Bengal has stated that the delay in the implementation of the food policy in Bengal may be till next year on account of the failure of the Government of India to fulfil all that they said that they would be able to fulfil. That is a very important point.

Shri A. P. Jain: As I said, Sir, a senior officer of the Government of India is in Calcutta to see that these policies are implemented as quickly as possible. That officer may be returning, and I shall be in a position to supply specific facts tomorrow, I believe. I hope I shall be in a position to give information to the House on the points mentioned by the hon. Speaker tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Unless, of course, there is specific reply to these, it will be difficult to say that the motion may not be allowed, because it is a very important matter undoubtedly affecting vast areas, and we have to be specific on the point. I would request the hon. Minister to be specific in giving information on these points. So I postpone the consideration of this for the time being.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

AFTERNOON SITTINGS

Mr. Speaker: Now, there is one other matter in respect of which I would like to make an announcement. I find that the hon. Members are naturally anxious or keen to see that this session comes to an end as originally planned, that is, 31st July, and that, in any case, it does not extend further unduly, and it is, therefore, necessary that the House should sit longer each day. I am not trying to decide the general question as to how many hours the House should sit in future, or from what hour to what hour. My remarks and the arrangements which I have considered proper after consultation with the various parties in the House including Government, are only for purposes of the present session. So, apart from carrying on the debates within reasonable limits and with as much shortness as possible and keeping to relevancy, I propose that in addition to the morning sessions that we have from 8-15 to one o'clock, the House may sit for two days in the week in the afternoon from 3-30 to 6-30. That will give us six hours in addition. That means practically one day. And if we sit on Tuesdays and Fridays, that will give some kind of time for the hon. Members also to study, for the Committees to meet and the extended time for Parliament. If necessary, we shall be sitting on more days than two in a week. Saturdays will be off days. That is necessary, I think, to relieve the over-strain on hon. Members, and there will be Committee meetings also during that period. I think it would be possible for hon. Members serving on the Committees to sit during the hours when Parliament is in session, unless some Members have ungent work in the House in connection with any Bill in the House that they cannot afford to be absent. Our rules permit that kind of thing. After all, it is our experience that all the Members are not present in the House at all times, and some of the Members might help the early disposal of work by agreeing to sit for the work of the Committees during the time when Parliament is in session, provided, of course, each Member will have the right to judge for himself as to whether his presence is necessary in the House or not.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Can I make a suggestion, Sir? Instead of sitting on one and the same day from 8-15 to one o'clock, and then from 3-30 to 6-30, we may sit from 12 to six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: If I were to discuss the matter here, it means out of the time available till the end of the session, half an hour at least will be lost. Therefore, let us accept this arrangement which is generally agreed to by different sections of the House, and for the next session and the permanent arrangements, the hon. Members might

[Mr. Speaker]

reconsider the position, and I am in the hands of the House. Whatever they decide, I shall accept.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): Instead of taking two days in a week, Tuesdays and Fridays, why not sit on Saturday, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that upto the time fixed for receiving nominations for the Central Advisory Board of Education, six nominations were received. Subsequently, three Members withdrew their candidature. As the number of the remaining candidates was thus equal to the number of vacancies in the Committee, I declare the following Members to be duly elected:

1. Shri T. Madiah Gowda.
2. Shri Venkatesh Narayan Tivary.
3. Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATES

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of the Council of States:

> "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (5) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (Railways) No. 2 Bill, 1952, which was passed by the House of the People at its sitting held on the 4th July, 1952, and transmitted to the Council of States for its recommendations, and to state that the Council has no recommendations to make to the House of the People in regard to the said Bill."

INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL

[AMENDMENT OF SECTION 302]

Shri Kazmi (Sultanpur Distt.—North *cum* Faizabad Dist.—South-West): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Kazmi: I introduce the Bill.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): Sir, I do not propose to introduce at this stage the Bill to provide for the prohibition of manufacture and import of hydrogenated Vegetable Oils.

Mr. Speaker: Very well.

DOWRY RESTRAINT BILL

Shrimati Jayashri (Bombay-Suburban): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for restraining the taking or giving of dowry in connection with marriages and for matters incidental thereto.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for restraining the taking or giving of dowry in connection with marriages and for matters incidental thereto."

The motion was adopted.

Shrimati Jayashri: I introduce the Bill.

INDIAN PENAL CODE AND CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898".

The motion was adopted.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I introduce the Bill.

DOWRY RESTRAINT BILL

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to restrain the custom of taking or giving of dowry in marriages.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to restrain the custom of taking or giving of dowry in marriages."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Dabhi: I introduce the Bill.

PUNISHMENT FOR ADULTERATION OF FOODSTUFFS BILL

Shri Jhunjhunwala (Bhagalpur Central): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for punishment of those found guilty of adulteration of foodstuffs.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for punishment of those found guilty of adulteration of foodstuffs."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: I introduce the Bill.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Shri Madhao Reddi (Adilabad): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

I would like to make a statement, Sir. ...

Shri Pocker Saheb (Malappuram): As there are many Members who do not know what this Bill is about, will the hon. Speaker be pleased to give a gist of the objects and reasons of the Bill, so that the Members might know what it is about in order to enable them to exercise their votes?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The hon Member from the other side said that he did not know what this was. Nobody, in fact, no Member of the Government knew either what this was. I doubt if many Members of the House knew about this, except that we have all suddenly seen that it is an amendment to the Constitution. [An amendment to the Constitution is a rather serious thing—it may be a good thing, but it is a serious thing. It has to be considered carefully and properly and not be allowed to come in by a side-door and without the Members knowing anything about it, their voting this way or that way. I seek your guidance in the matter. I submit that I am not going to say anything on the merits of the question. It may be good or bad, but when there is a question of amending the Constitution, some slightly special procedure might be adopted either by the Government or by Members of the Opposition, and it should not come in this way, when people do not even know what they might have to vote for.]

Shri R. K. Chaudhury (Gauhati): On a point of order, Sir. It has been a convention in this House not to oppose the grant of leave *(Interruptions)*.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members may kindly leave all these matters to the Chair. Otherwise, I am prepared to vacate the Chair, and they may settle the point among themselves. Let there be no interruptions.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: In view of what has been just now said by the hon. the Leader of the House, I would submit that we are not cognizant of many Bills, and we know about them only after they are introduced. Therefore, the convention was—it had grown up in the previous House at least—that we do not oppose leave to introduce a Bill. I know that the Opposition has started first the ball rolling by opposing such leave before. But that is no reason why we should not respect the convention which we have created, especially when that convention has been there for a very long time, not only in this Parliament, but in the previous Parliament as also in the Central Legislature before. Therefore, Sir, I would ask you, in the circumstances mentioned by the hon. the Leader of the House, to continue that convention.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta—South-East): May I draw your attention to one thing? What the hon. the Prime Minister has said certainly deserves consideration, that we should not lightly attempt to amend the Constitution. But article 368 which lays down the procedure for amendment of the Constitution reads:

> "An amendment of this Constitution may be initiated only by the introduction of a Bill for the purpose in either House of Parliament............"

Our rules also do not lay down that while a Bill to amend the Constitution is to be introduced, a different procedure is to be followed. It can

[Dr. S. P. Mukerjee]

only be done by the introduction of a Bill under the provisions in the rules, unless we amend them otherwise.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): Whether an objection is raised or not, if a Bill is to be passed, it must conform both to the Constitution and the rules framed under the Constitution. Under article 368, a special procedure has been prescribed for amending the Constitution. The Constitution itself treats such a Bill in a special way as different from the other Bills. Hon. Members are aware that with regard to financial Bills, there is a particular procedure which has been prescribed, namely that they can be introduced only in a particular House and so on. Likewise, the Constitution also is a thing which ought not to be lightly interfered with. My feeling is that at this stage itself, whether any objection is raised or not, the persons who sponsor the Bill must themselves get a vote of 51 per cent. majority in the House, and also of 66 2/3 per cent. of the members that are present. I do not agree with the contention that this applies only to the third reading stage, merely because it is said that if a Bill is passed, it must receive the assent of the President. The passing of a Bill requires three stages. Without introduction, there cannot be any passing at a later stage. There is no question of circumscribing the provisions of the Bill or limiting the meaning of this article only to the last stage...........

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That question will arise only if those who want to introduce the Bill get a majority, and not till then. Supposing the motion to grant leave is defeated, how will that question arise? At this stage, it is problematical.

Pandit Thakurdas Bhargava (Gurgaon): May I make a submission before the House, Sir? On a previous occassion, when Mr. Kamath's Bill was sought to be introduced, the motion for grant of leave to introduce was defeated at the very first instance. Therefore, it is not true to say that in respect of every Bill, permission to introduce is given as a matter of course.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I confess that this matter has taken many of us by surprise, because we did not know what this Bill was: even when Members are voting for it, we do not know what it is for. Only about a minute or two ago, we saw that it is an amendment to the Constitution. It does raise some important issues as my hon. friend has just pointed out. I would submit that—you, Sir, not so much in regard to this particular matter, but for future guidance, may consider this—for the present, I would, if I may say so, respectfully advise the House not to oppose the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Madhao Reddi: I introduce the Bill.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

INDIAN CATTLE PRESERVATION BILL

सेठ गोविन्द दास (मंडला-जबलपुर दक्षिण) : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूं कि मुझे अपने पशुधन रक्षा सम्बन्धी विधेयक को उपस्थित करने की अनुमति दी जाय ।

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I may tell the House at once that I am not going to oppose the introduction of the Bill. But I only wish to make it clear...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At this stage no speech of any kind is allowed.

Motion moved:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to preserve the milch and draught cattle of the country."

Shri Biswas: All that I wish to state is, as I have already pointed out to the Mover himself, that this Bill is *ultra vires* of the Constitution, because it deals with a subject which is in the State List. The question of preservation of cattle is a matter exclusively for the States to deal with, because it is an item included in List No. II. I have pointed out also that I do not propose to oppose the introduction of the Bill, as I do not want to break the the established convention in this respect. Having regard to a previous ruling of yours given on another occasion when a similar Bill was introduced by my hon. friend, in 1947, and you said that you would not rule it out of order, I am not inviting you either to rule the present Bill out of order now, on the ground that it is *ultra vires*, but I am only giving notice to the hon. the Mover that when the Bill comes up for consideration, Government reserves the right to oppose it not merely on the ground that it is *ultra vires*, but on merits as well.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Rule 72 provides that if a motion for leave to introduce a Bill is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who moves from the Member who opposes the motion, may, without further debate, put the question. I propose doing it.

The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to preserve the milch and draught cattle of the country."

The motion was adopted.

सेट गोविन्द दास : में इस विधेयक को उपस्थित करता हूं ।

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT BILL

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh Amravati East): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to make provision for employment and training for employment and to establish a comprehensive youth employment service.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to make provision for employment and training for employment and to establish a comprehensive youth employment service."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I introduce the Bill.

ORPHANAGE BILL

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी (जिला हमीरपुर): जिनके माता पिता अथवा दूसरा कोई संरक्षक जीवित न हो, ऐसे अनाथ बालकों के सरकार द्वारा पालन-पोषण, शिक्षा-दीक्षा तथा अन्य संरक्षण के लिये मैं एक विधेयक प्रस्तुत करने के लिये सदन की अनुमति चाहता हूं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Was notice given in Hindi?

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: I gave the notice in Hindi, but was asked to give the English translation also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for bringing up, maintenance and education of children who have lost their parents and have no other person to look after them in proper manner."

The motion was adopted.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : मैं विधेयक प्रस्तुत करता हूं ।

MONOGAMY ENFORCEMENT BILL

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to enforce monogamy and to prohibit and penalise future bigamous marriages and to declare them illegal.

Shri Pocker Saheb (Malappuram): I oppose this motion. It is against the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have duly taken note of the hon. Member's opposition. He is in a minority. The question has been allowed.

Shri Pocker Saheb. You may rule it out, but I raise my objection to it on the ground that it is against the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the hon. Member is a little too late.

Shri Pocker Saheb: Not at all. I have been bawling out from the very beginning.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to enforce monogamy and to prohibit and penalise future bigamous marriages and to declare them illegal."

The motion was adopted.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I introduce the Bill.

MUSLIM WAKFS BILL

Shri Kazmi (Sultanpur Distt.—North *cum* Faizabad Distt.—South-West): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the better governance and administration of Muslim Wakfs and the supervision of Mutawallis' management of them, in India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the better governance and administration of Muslim Wakfs and the supervision of Mutawallis' management of them, in India."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Kasmi: I introduce the Bill.

STERILISATION OF THE UNFIT BILL

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to prevent procreation of human beings of undesirable physical and mental conditions by certain types of people.

10 A.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is the preamble. In the body it will have been made clear. (*Interruptions*) There is no provision for any discussion at this stage. If any hon. Members want to oppose, they may say 'no'.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): Sir, I oppose the introduction of the Bill...

An Hon. Member: You cannot make a speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him state what he has to say.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: The Bill is not only *ultra vires* but is also against all morality. Therefore, I oppose it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to prevent procreation of human beings of undesirable physical and mental conditions by certain types of people."

The motion was adopted.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I introduce the Bill.

INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL

[AMENDMENT OF SECTION 497]

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Dabhi: I introduce the Bill.

PREVENTION OF BIGAMOUS MARRIAGES BILL

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the prevention of bigamous marriages.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the prevention of bigamous marriages."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Pataskar: I introduce the Bill.

CODE OF CRIMANAI PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL

[REPEAL OF SECTIONS 266 ETC.]

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It must have been indicated here what exactly the section is.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Sir, it relates to the jury and assessor system.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898"

The motion was adopted.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I introduce the Bill.

DOWRY RESTRAINT BILL

Shrimati Uma Nehru (Sitapur Distt. *cum* Kheri Distt.—West): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to restrain the custom of taking or giving of dowry in marriages.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to restrain the custom

of taking or giving of dowry in marriages."

The motion was adopted.

Shrimati Uma Nehru: I introduce the Bill.

INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

[AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 53, 121, 132 ETC.]

Shri R. K. Chaudhury (Gauhati): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860."

The motion was adopted.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: I introduce the Bill

HINDU DIVORCE BILL

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for a right of divorce among all Communities of Hindus in certain circumstances.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): Sir, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for a right of divorce among all Communities of Hindus in certain circumstances."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Pataskar: I introduce the Bill.

PREVENTION OF JUVENILE VAGRANCY AND BEGGING BILL

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी (जिला हमीरपुर): बाल भिक्षा और बाल आवारागर्दी के निषेध के सम्बन्ध में मैं एक विधेयक प्रस्तुत करने के लिये सदन की अनुमति चाहता हूं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to make provision for **the prevention of juvenile vagrancy and begging."**

The motion was adopted.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : मैं विधेयक प्रस्तुत करता हूं।

CONTROL OF EXPORT AND STANDARDISATION OF HANDLOOM CLOTH BILL

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to control the export and the standardisation of handloom cloth.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to control the export and the standardisation of handloom cloth."

The motion was adopted.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I introduce the Bill.

MUSLIM KAZIS BILL

Shri Kazmi (Sutanpur Distt.-North *cum* Faizabad Distt.-South-West): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the appointment of persons to the office of Kazis and for performing and keeping a record of marriages and for the appointment of tribunals for trying and deciding cases of divorce and dissolution of marriage amongst Muslims.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the appointment of persons to the office of Kazis and for performing and keeping a record of marriages and for the appointment of tribunals for trying and deciding cases of divorce and dissolution of marriage amongst Muslims."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Kasmi: I introduce the Bill.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for protection, maintenance, custody, education and employment of children.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for protection, maintenance, custody, education and employment of children."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I introduce the Bill.

Shri Jhulan Sinha: (Saran North): I am not introducing my Bill today.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All the private Members' business is over.

The House will now take up Government legislative business.

INDIAN TARIFF (THIRD AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why is the other Bill, that is the Tea Control (Amendment) Bill, left over?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is coming up later.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is there any special urgency for this Bill? Normally when a Bill is already before the House and is half discussed, naturally hon. Members expect that it should be continued unless, of course, there are any special reasons why it should be passed over and some other Bill taken up.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I might submit that the order of business is arranged by the office under instructions from the hon. Speaker. I have really no part or lot in this excepting that I had suggested that the Bill is rather urgent.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Normally, unless the Minister is anxious and there is special urgency, I will not allow two Bills to be before the House.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I do plead guilty, Sir, that I am anxious.

Section 4A of the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, as amended by the amending Act of 1950 conferred emergency powers on the Central Government, by notification, to direct an amendment in the Second Schedule to the former Act to be made so as to increase or levy an export duty on any article. But every notification so issued, by reason of the provisions of sub-section (3) of that amendment, ceased to have effect from the 1st day of March 1952 irrespective of whether Parliament had or had not approved of the duties imposed by these notifications. The present position is that section 4A has become inoperative because of the fact that notifications have ceased to have effect from the 1st day of March, 1952. The position, as the Government now envisages, is that Government need these powers because of certain other considerations. The levy of an export duty, as the House will understand, is not *per se* for the purpose of collecting revenue for the Government. It is more or less an economic corrective. The House will also understand that the burden of export duties does not happen to fall on either the producer or the consumer in this country but it is passed on to a buyer in another country. But this question of Government having to use these powers as an economic corrective is there under the present conditions because I feel that the conditions that existed in December, 1950, when section 4A was originally introduced, do obtain still. The administration of this particular section by the Government, as the House will have had an opportunity of reviewing it, would demonstrate that Government have been using these powers with a great amount of discretion. The House will be aware that recently there have been two large reductions in the export duty in regard to jute which has benefited our jute industry to a considerable extent. A question was asked this morning whether burlap enjoys a certain amount of preference in U. S. and I had to answer in the affirmative.

At the same time there is one difficulty in regard to Government giving up this provision altogether and coming to the House by way of an ordinary Bill. The matter is one of taxation, taxation on goods in which there is a lot of speculation. The Government is not empowered in the same way it ordinarily is through the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act which is used for the normal imposition of either duties or taxes. This question has to be decided more or less on the spur of the moment taking into consideration the prevailing conditions, and if the ordinary methods of legislation were adopted it is possible that people who deal in a particular commodity, who speculate in that particular commodity, might take advantage of Government's intentions and the Government's ultimate objectives might be frustrated. So, on a review of what has been happening all this year and a half or year and four months, the Government have come to the conclusion that it is best to have section 4A as a permanent provision in the Tariff Act. The control of Parliament over Governmental action in this regard is complete because no notification issued by Government can stay put without a reference to Parliament as soon as it assembles and without Parliamentary approval. Therefore, Parliament can rest assured that that control is there and kept intact.

Hon. Members in this House might ask: What are the particular articles on which you would probably levy an export duty at the present moment? Well, I might ask for forgiveness from hon. Members because that is a matter which I could not disclose, because the very essence of it is that Government have to act swiftly. I might say this much: There are one or two commodities in which probably the Ministry of Commerce and Industry might have recommended to the Ministry of Finance that export duty might be levied which would be to the advantage of the economy of this country, but we could not do it because the powers had lapsed on the 1st March, 1952.

There is yet another reason why clause 3 of this particular Bill is necessary. There are four instances covering cloth, groundnuts, oilseeds not otherwise specified, vegetable oils not otherwise specified, in which action has been taken by the Ministry of Finance, Revenue Division, under the powers vested in Government under section 4A which have now lapsed and the continuance of which happens to be necessary.

These are the circumstances in which Government have come before the House asking for placing this section 4A on the statute-book. The amending Bill is self-explanatory. In clause 2(a) the words "a temporary amendment" are taken away and the words "an amendment" are introduced so as to indicate the Government's desire that it should form part of the Indian Tariff Act. Clause 2(b) gives powers to Government to rescind—it is a variation of the original sub-clause (3) which indicates that the operation of this particular section will come to an end with the 1st March, 1952. Here it states that the Government may rescind even though a particular notification has been approved by Parliament—whether it has been approved or has not been approved, Government can rescind these notifications if other conditions demand it. Clause 3, as I said, is more or less the re-validation of the present position because the notification in respect of these four commodities has to be kept in force. Therefore, Government are asking that retrospective effect be given to the present amendment. If it is approved by the House, then these notifications will be kept in force.

I suggest that there are no snags in this Bill. Nothing is concealed. No powers are attempted to be taken by Government under a subterfuge. It is very plain sailing, as Members both on my side and on the side of the Opposition will understand. Whatever the Government does must ultimately come to the House for sanction. If the House refuses to sanction a particular duty, then the notification will cease to have effect. That position is covered and maintained and I hope the House will pass the consideration motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration."

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Under clause 2(b), the Central Government is taking power to rescind and modify any notification which has already been approved by Parliament. I would like to know whether this power is to be used only during the interval and that the notifications will come up before the House when the specified period is over and Parliament meets again. I could not catch the hon. Minister on this point.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If the hon. Member would refer to the original sub-section (3) which has lapsed and which is now sought to be reproduced, he will find that it says:

> "Subject to the provisions of sub-section (2) of this section and section 21 of the General Clauses Act, 1897, every such notification shall have effect on and from the date thereof, but shall cease to have effect on the 1st day of March 1952."

Now, Section 21 of the General Clauses Act runs thus:

> "Where by any Central Act or Regulation a power to issue notifications, orders, rules or bye-laws is conferred, then that power includes a power exercisable in like manner and subject to the like sanction and conditions if any, to add to, amend, vary or rescind any notifications, orders, rules or bye-laws so issued."

In the original sub-section this had been reproduced. Not that it was necessary and it was done. The powers under section 21 of the General Clauses Act remain, whether it is men-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

tioned in the body of a Bill or not. But here we have made it plain that they may be rescinded or varied.

As the hon. Member will understand, in regard to the jute duties Government reduced them to a certain level at one stage and then they reduced them further. The whole idea is this. If actually any increase is made, naturally Parliament will be informed, but if any reduction is made, excepting the sending of an ordinary intimation to Parliament, there is no question of parliamentary sanction for the purpose of effecting a reduction. It is an economic corrective and Government will have to take action from time to time. The powers that are vested in Government under section 21 of the General Clauses Act still remain, whether they are mentioned or not. But since we have taken away that particular clause, the position has been amplified and it does not mean that the Government are taking any more power So far as varying the duty in a manner which will reduce the duty, it is very necessary that the Government should first do so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is sub-section (2)?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sub-section (2) remains. It says that every such notification shall be laid before Parliament, if it is in session, as soon as may be after the issue of the notification, and if it is not in session, within seven days of its re-assembling and the Central Government shall seek the approval of Parliament to the notification by a resolution moved within a period of fifteen days beginning on the date on which the notification was issued and if the Parliament makes any modification in the notification or directs that the notification shall cease to have effect, the notification shall thereafter be issued in such modified form or be declared to have ceased to have any effect, as the case may be, without prejudice to anything done previously under such notification. That provision remains.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): Some explanation is due from the Minister as to why this amendment was not brought forward earlier. It places the Government in a very embarrassing position. Apparently, under the 1934 Act, this power given to the Government to levy export duties by notification lapsed on the 1st March 1952. There was a session of Parliament during that period and we are now faced with an extraordinary situation in which the Government have levied duties which practically they have no legal authority to do. Therefore, we are being called upon now to validate certain notifications, which were wrongly issued. It was due to serious lapse on the part of someone in the Government, for easily this amendment could have been made earlier. We have been collecting these duties illegally and I appreciate why the hon. Minister is very anxious that the Bill should be passed into law as quickly as possible.

Secondly, the hon. Minister has not explained why he wants to remove all reference to the date. Apparently, it was thought that this power given to the Executive Government should be limited to a certain date on account of the special conditions prevailing in the country, though normally these duties are levied by a Bill placed before Parliament, when the House has a chance to experss its opinion before the duty is fixed and not merely hold a post-mortem examination. That is why the date, 1st March 1952, was fixed. There may be a case for extension of the date. Government may extend it by another year or two years. But is the hon. Minister satisfied that it will serve the purpose of having the necessary check in such matters if we remove the date altogether? This matter concerns Parliament also. The hon. Minister just touched the point, but did not explain what exactly was the necessity for withdrawing altogether this outer limit from the Bill. What is now proposed is this. There is no question of "temporary" amendment. If you take away this outer limit of any date, then naturally the expression "temporary amendment" also has to be withdrawn. It now becomes a part of the normal law and Government can by executive order make any amendment and the only precaution is that under sub-section (2) to which the hon. Minister just referred the matter will be placed before the House and the House may have a chance of making a modification. But that will be after the Government have made a decision and fixed the quantum of the duty to be imposed and announced it. I am not disputing that there may be occasions when these decisions have to be taken very quickly and a certain amount of secrecy also has to be observed, because otherwise it may lead to all sorts of undesirable consequences. I am quite prepared to admit that that contingency may arise in the disturbed economic conditions through which the country is passing today, but would it not serve the purposes of Government if instead of removing the date altogether the date is extented? Let us extend it to the 1st March 1954—two years. Without this, the ultimate authority of Parliament in normal cases to consider this matter before the duty is actually levied will be permanently abrogated. That is the point of view which I would like to place before the Minister for his consideration.

Shri Pocker Saheb (Malappuram): The proposed sub-section (3) in clause 2 reads as follows:

> "For the removal of doubts it is hereby declared that any notification approved by Parliament, whether with or without modifications, may be rescinded by the Central Government at any time by notification in the Official Gazette."

The purport of it appears to be that though under the previous law an order issued by Government had to be approved by Parliament, hereafter there is no necessity for such approval. I am not quite clear in my mind as to whether the later notification has to be placed before Parliament or not before it is given effect to. If that condition is there—that the subsequent notification of the Central Government, either rescinding or modifying the previous order has to be approved by Parliament—it would be unobjectionable. In the absence of such a provision, it is objectionable. I hope the position will be clarified by the hon. Minister.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I ask a question of the hon. Minister? Can the Minister give us some idea of the total amount of illegal recoveries that have been made since the lapse of the notification. We are asked to legalise the whole thing; so we should at least know the quantum of the particular duties.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): The subject matter of this Bill relates to delegation of fiscal power by this Parliament to the executive. On this question there were prolonged discussions on two occasions recently: once at the end of 1950 when a Bill very similar to this was being discussed and then later on in March 1951.

In 1950 a very long discussion took place on this question of delegated authority and the House had to adjourn itself in order to come to some agreement. The hon. Dr. Ambedkar while dealing with this question, which again related to the amendment of this very Act, had a few things to say. I will quote from the proceeding of Parliament held on 4th December 1950. He said:

> "I have no doubt in my mind that that is the correct attitude"—that is, delegated authority should not be given to the executive—"which Parliament should adopt in the matter of taxation. The power to tax is a very important power. It is really the one and the only power which Parliament possesses to control the Government, to order the Government and if Parliament were to give its permanent power of rising revenue to the executive, the executive would not care two hoots for Parliament."

Then later on he went on to say:

> "I also came to the conclusion that probably from the point of view of financial propriety, from the point of view of maintaining the supremacy of Parliament, it was desirable to make some amendments in the clauses as they stood in the original Bill."

After this the House adjourned and they arrived at a certain agreed formula, which provided two safeguards in the Bill. One was that this power should be restricted for about a year, that is, this Act was to remain in force till the 1st day of March 1952. The other safeguard was that soon after the issue of notification under this Act, the notification should be brought before Parliament within a week of its meeting and discussed within two weeks of the placing of the notification.

The second power is remaining. About this second power an hon. Member—I am quoting from his speech on that occasion—said as follows:

> "Well, Sir, I will ask my hon. friend on the Treasury Benches; Do they envisage that with a party which belongs to them in the House it is possible for the House to say: 'we will not accept a *fait accompli* for which the Ministry is the cause. No; it is not possible; even though I may have a conscientious objection to support Government action, I would stay away from the debate rather than get up and oppose a measure which seeks to put the imprimatur on an action taken by my hon. friend, the Minister of Commerce and Industry."

[Shri Bansal]

This was said by my hon. friend who is the Commerce and Industry Minister today. If it was correct in December 1950, I do not know how it is invalidated now by his mere transference to the Treasury Benches.

I am not against giving this power to the executive, because I realise that now-a-days we are passing through very difficult times. Government have to take action about these matters at very short notice. They cannot be expected to bring forward a Bill before Parliament even when it is in session because of the speculative element involved. I am against the use of the power of Ordinance, because it is repugnant to democracy. Therefore, Government should have some such power as contemplated in the Bill. I would only request the hon. Minister to accede to the request of the House that there must be a time-limit here. I do not even say that this power should not be given permanently. but then it must be open to the review of the House every year. So that whatever notifications are issued by Government and discussed in Parliament may again come before Parliament for a general review. so that whatever has happened during the course of the year will be reviewed by Parliament. This is after all a supreme body and the Ministry or the Minister concerned should have nothing to fear if it is a legitimate case and Parliament would be very happy to grant the necessary sanction for the continuance of the Act.

I have not been able to give notice of an amendment, because this Bill was introduced only day before yesterday and we got the Bill yesterday. Within such a short time it was not possible to go into the Bill, which though it looks very small is a very important one.. I would therefore request the hon. Minister to bring forward an official amendment substituting the figures "1953" or "1954" in place of "1952" in the Act.

I have another small point to make which has already been made by Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. Obviously somebody has been dozing in the Ministry, if not actually sleeping—dozing for a continuous period of four months. It is surprising that in Government such a thing should happen. It would not be tolerated anywhere else. I suggest that as Government had no authority to levy these duties which have been levied from April 1952 up-to-date, as Government have no legitimate right to those duties, they must be refunded and that would be a salutary lesson to those people who have been sleeping over it.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: And recover it from those who were sleeping!

Shri Bansal: No it cannot be recovered; I do not suggest that. But if my suggestion is accepted they will be more vigilant in the future. If you gloss over these things I do not know how the executive could be made to mind their business by this supreme body. I take a very strong view of this.

The third point I have to make is this. The proposed sub-section (3) reads thus:

> "For the removal of doubts it is hereby declared that any notification etc."

I think this is hardly the language appropriate for an Act. This reads the language of a notification. Therefore, this should come either as a proviso or as an explanation. The legal experts and the draftsmen of the Government of India may look into it. I am a novice. I am not an experienced legislator. I would, therefore, request the hon. Minister to look into this. This should more appropriately come as a proviso or as an explanation rather than as a substantive part of a section of the Act because the wording looks more like that of a notification or a Government order.

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West): I have given notice of an amendment which I shall move at the appropriate stage. Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee and my friend Shri Bansal have already explained the point of view we have. I would only like to add that these powers are generally for emergency conditions. After all, an emergency does not exist every time. I do feel it may be necessary for a year or two. But these powers to be taken for all time to come is rather asking Parliament to delegate its powers to the executive so that we will have, so to say, to surrender our supremacy with respect to certain things. After all, taxation must come before Parliament. I mean every time when any duty is enhanced or reduced it has always been brought forward before Parliament in the Finance Bill.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Not when it is reduced.

Shri Tulsidas: In normal times the levy of any duty always used to figure in the Finance Bill, in the Budget. Therefore, in this case also, when the times are normal, Parliament should not allow for all time the power of levying a duty or of increasing the duty in the hands of the executive. I feel very strongly about it, and I think some time-limit must be put.

The hon. Minister has said that on the spur of the moment or looking to the circumstances he may find it necessary that certain duties on certain articles may have to be levied or increased. I do not dispute that these powers are necessary for a certain time. But there must be a time-limit. It is very essential, and the point has been made out by Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee very ably.

As regards the point about refunding made by my friend on the other side, I think Government has to take a lesson that the executive must always be alert and they should not exercise the powers on the presupposition that Parliament will give them the necessary approval. It does not speak well of the Ministry. I am not pressing for refund, but this is a very serious matter.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: How much has the hon. Member paid?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think the suggestion goes so far as to say that personally the persons in charge must pay.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: No, no.

Shri Tulsidas: I feel very strongly that these powers must be limited to a particular period, may be one year or two years. I have tabled an amendment in this respect which I shall move at the appropriate time.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I have to submit a few words on this matter. In December 1950 this question cropped up in the House. And the question was whether we should delegate this authority...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If I may interrupt the hon. Member, I have a doubt, and the hon. Member may also speak with reference to it.

The hon. Minister will see that the wording in section 4A is "The Central Government may...direct a temporary amendment of the Second Schedule". In the nature of things, by this amendment it is perpetual. Is it not therefore opposed to the provisions of section 4A?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): We have also proposed an amendment to omit the word "temporary".

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: There should be another amendment then because section 4A starts with "Emergency power..." The word "emergency" should also then go.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is not correct. The exercise of the power is in terms of an emergency. But the exercise of a power in terms of an emergency does not mean that a statutory provision should always be a temporary one.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Emergency can hardly be perpetual.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Emergency may arise from time to time; the power is perpetual. The power has to be exercised whenever an emergency arises. I do not think there is much difference.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I was submitting that this point came up before this House in 1950. It was gone into at length. I was then of the opinion that as a matter of fact we were not competent to delegate this authority and I quoted our own Constitution in this respect. But it was held by the House that since the Constitution of Great Britain allowed such delegation to be made, therefore it was in order and it was resolved by the House that this power be given. But at the same time I do remember that we went into a conference and we ultimately came to a compromise by virtue of which the Bill was passed. And we imposed on that occasion certain conditions under which the Government should exercise these powers. There it was that the time was fixed upto March 1952.

Now, I for one am very jealous about the rights of the House and I want that so far as this Parliament is concerned this Parliament is the only body before whom all these things should come as far as possible and delegated authority should only be exercised on such occasions when the coming of those matters before Parliament was fraught with certain difficulties or when it was in the interest of the country to do so. I can visualize to myself conditions in which the Ministry may be armed with such powers and on occasions the Ministry may use them for the benefit of the country. I do not know what these conditions were in these four months, and I do not know what they are at present. At the same time I have got confidence in the Commerce Minister and the Ministry as a whole, and if these powers are exercised by them I have no objection. But I do want so far as this Parliament is concerned that these powers may not be delegated as a matter of course.

[**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava**]

And I would rather support the proposal of my hon. friend Dr. Mookerjee that so far as this Bill is concerned we will be well advised in changing the date to—he says 1954, but I would rather say 1953, so that subsequently whenever it is considered necessary the matter again comes to this House. As I have already said, we have confidence in the Ministry and they can take it that we are not going to say that they cannot exercise these powers. But it should not behave in such a manner as to usurp the powers of the House itself. I would respectfully submit for the consideration of the hon. Minister that when he himself has been quoted in this respect he ought to see that his own view while he was an ordinary Member of this House are respected by him. I would therefore beg of him to agree to change the date to 1953 so that both the things may be safeguarded, namely, the right of the executive to take such action as is necessary in the interests of the country as well as the right of Parliament to consider matters which are in its own province particularly and to have the final say in the matter. I would therefore like that the change be made that instead of 1st March 1952 it should be 1st March 1953— though, if the hon. Minister wants to take powers for a longer time, I will not very much oppose such a demand.

In regard to the matters which took place four months ago I must also join my friend—not in the drastic remedy which he proposed, because that is now out of the question and we cannot implement it. How can we reach those people and make refunds? Who will benefit from it? All these are very complicated questions. All the same, I cannot but record my sense, I should say, of protest, to use a mild word at the manner in which things have been done. Why should for four months certain taxes be levied without the sanction of Parliament? It is not a question of any persons approving or disapproving of it. On the contrary I would like the hon. Commerce Minister to give an explanation to this House why this was so. Who was at fault? If any particular person was at fault, it is the duty of this House and the hon. Commerce Minister to see that that person is brought to book. Public matters should not be dealt with in this manner. After four months, the hon. Commerce Minister comes before this House and asks us to validate what was illegal to start with. This is most deplorable.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I do not wish to take much of the time of the House; but I think it is my duty to add my voice to the voices on this side, including, I am glad to say, the voice of Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, who tried to point out very cogently that Government has done something about which certain explanation ought to be offered to this House, before we pass this kind of legislation that has been placed before the House.

It is quite obvious that certain backstairs methods have been adopted; it is quite obvious that the ambit of Parliamentary legislation has been encroached into by the executive and by means of what looks like a footling little Bill, by means of a Bill which attracts very little notice of the Members of this House, certain things are sought to be done, which really impinge upon the prerogatives of this House. I need not amplify the points which have already been made. I would only say that the process which the Government have adopted in regard to the changes in the levy of export duties is a process which is against all canons of democracy, and if we are now going to rectify certain errors which naturally cannot be helped at this point of time, let us do that with those precautions which are absolutely necessary. Therefore, let us not extend the operation of the provisions proposed in this Bill beyond as short a time as possible. I would suggest that 1953 may perhaps be adopted as far as the extension is concerned. I do not think I should speak any more; but I do wish to say that the Government, in this matter, has behaved in such a fashion that it owes it to itself and to the House to explain its conduct in regard to this particular legislation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This should have been introduced before 1st March?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Yes; he should have got the Bill passed before the 1st March.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We cannot go into the entire thing now. That would be covered under the Parliamentary rules. Extending a particular Bill up to a particular period: that is the only subject matter. The Minister would not have been delinquent in that case.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Quite right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does it make any difference? Does any other hon. Member want to say anything? Yes; Mr. Gandhi.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazaribagh West): I have to say something.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called the other hon. Member. I shall call the hon. Member later.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City-North): I think the House would be well advised to give its approval to this Indian Tariff (Third Amendment) Bill.

This Bill, we must remember, has something to do with the future of our export trade. Whatever happens to our export trade is going to determine in the very near future whatever success or failure we are going to have in our many economic plans, including our Five Year National Economic plan. The Bill, obviously, deals with the levy of export duties and the powers that are sought to be taken by the Government are powers that would enable the Government either to levy immediately duties on new articles or to alter the existing duties on articles which have been leviable to duty so far.

There is a question of imposing a time-limit on the operation of this Bill. As suggested by Dr. S. P. Mookerjee and also my hon. friend Mr. Bansal, I would have no objection to some kind of reasonable time-limit being placed on the operation of this Bill. I would rather hesitate to go as far as Mr. Bansal who suggested an annual consideration of the Bill. The administration should have some reasonably long time within which to operate. Another thing that we must remember is that the action which the administration has to take under this Bill is an action that it has to take sometimes in cases where the initiative may not always lie with this Government. Let us consider an instance. Suppose some day, tomorrow or any day, the British Government decides to have a further devaluation of the pound, immediately a situation will arise in respect of our export trade where the Government will have to act promptly and immediately. Therefore, such powers are necessary, where a delay will be to the detriment of the revenues of the Government. Perhaps we shall be throwing undeserved windfall profits into the laps of exporters in the case of a devaluation, whether it is in the case of the Government of the United Kingdom, or France or the United States, with whomsoever we have export trade in our staple commodities. There are also other kinds of situations where our export trade might be languishing or suffering because of our existing export duties being too high. In a case like that also, if the Government is required to come to this House with a Bill to ask for permission to alter the existing duties, I think that procedure will be certainly to the detriment of the interests of this country in its export trade. In view of these very important considerations, I shall again repeat that this House will be well advised to approve the Bill before it.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : कभी कभी जब मैं देखता हूं कि सभी दलों के लोग एक स्वर से ठीक बात बोलने लगते हैं तो हृदय में बड़ा आनन्द होता है। आज जो विषय सामने आया है, मैं देखता हूं कि उस पर हमारे भाई लोग बहुत ठीक बोल रहे हैं, और खासकर हमारे भाई जो ठाकुर दास जी हैं, यद्यपि वह चेले हो चुके हैं, लेकिन कभी कभी पुरानी बात याद आ जाती है। अब बात यह आती है कि हमारे मंत्री श्री कृष्णमाचारी ने भी कोई क़ुसूर नहीं किया है। वह तो नये मंत्री हैं। डिपार्टमेंट का ड्यूटी (duty) लगाने का अधिकार ३१ मार्च को ही ख़त्म हो गया था। इस के बाद जो रुपया लिया गया उस के बारे में हमारे भाई ठाकुर दास जी कहते हैं कि यह बड़ा मुश्किल मालूम होता है कि यह किस को रिफ़ंड (refund) किया जाये यह सब तो है, लेकिन यह जो कहा जाता है कि इस पार्लियामेंट के हुक्म के अनुसार सरकार काम करती है यह कैसे मालूम होगा। यह तो हम सीधे सीधे देखते हैं कि हमारे मंत्रियों आदि को भी कोई अधिकार वग़ैरह नहीं हैं। डिपार्टमेंट जो कहेगा हमारे मंत्री महोदय यहां ला कर दाखिल कर देंगे और पार्लियामेंट का भी संगठन ऐसा हो गया है कि वह भी कह देगी कि हां ठीक है। तो खासकर ऐसे विषय में जहां पर कि हमारे और भाई भी यह देख रहे हैं कि ग़लती हुई है, कोई सजा तो होनी चाहिये। यह क्या मतलब है ? मैं तो कहता हूं कि पार्लियामेंट को यह अधिकार होना चाहिये कि ऐसे ऐसे कामों के लिये तो समूचे डिपार्टमेंट को बरख़ास्त कर देना

(बाबू रामनारायण सिंह)

चाहिये। क्यों वह लोग पार्लियामेंट के हुकम के खिलाफ़ काम करते हैं। अगर वे लोग डिसमिस होने को नहीं हैं तो कम से कम यह तो होना चाहिये कि वे रुपए तो डिपार्टमेंट को न मिलें। उस को किसी तरह से रिफ़ंड किया जाये और अगर रिफ़ंड करने में भी कठिनाई है तो उस को दान कर दिया जाये। वह डिपार्टमेंट को क्यों मिलें। अगर हमारे मित्र कृष्णमाचारी, डिपार्टमेंट की तरफ़ से माफ़ी मांगें कि अब जो हो गया सो हो गया, आगें ऐसा क़सूर नहीं होगा, तो भी माफ़ी दी जा सकती है। लेकिन कोई माफ़ी भी नहीं मांगी जाती और क़सूर भी नहीं माना जाता। या अगर आयन्दा के लिये वायदा किया जाय कि आयन्दा ऐसा कार्य नहीं होगा तो भी उस को आप छोड़ दे सकते हैं।

लेकिन जब कुछ भी नहीं आता है तो कभी तो ड्रास्टिक स्टेप (drastic step) जिस को कहा जाता है लेना चाहिये। जब कोई खून करता है तो उसको फांसी दे दी जातीहै। क्या यह ड्रास्टिक स्टेप नहीं है? तो जब किसी को खून करने पर फांसी की सजा होती है तो डिपार्टमेंट क़सूर करे तो डिपार्टमेंट डिसमिस भी न हो, यह कौन सी बात है? ख़ैर, डिसमिस न हो तो कम से कम मेरे मित्र कृष्णमाचारी जी जोर से कहें कि कामर्स डिपार्टमेंट ने बड़ी भारी ग़लती की, बड़ा भारी क़ुसूर किया है और ऐसा अब आगे वह नहीं करेगा। ऐसा वादा करें तो आप फिर जैसा चाहें इस को पास कर दें, नहीं तो इस को रोक देना चाहिये। बहुत बातों में तो जैसा डिपार्टमेंट चाहे हो जाता है, जो उधर से आता है यहां पार्लियामेंट में पास हो जाता है। लेकिन जहां इस तरह की बात हो वहां तो कम से कम मालूम होना चाहिये कि पार्लियामेंट सरकार के ऊपर है। कभी कभी तो ऐसा मालूम होना चाहिये। बराबर देखा जाता है कि पार्लियामेंट डिपार्टमेंट के इशारे पर है, जो कोई चीज डिपार्टमेंट कह देता है पार्लियामेंट वही कर देती है। यही हम देखते हैं। लेकिन आज अवसर आया है जब हम सब सहमत हैं। तो ऐसे वक़्त तो मालूम होना चाहिये कि पार्लियामेंट कुछ है। मैं और अधिक नहीं कहता मगर यह कह देता हूं कि जब हम सब सहमत हैं तो कुछ होना चाहिये। तो तभी सहमत होने की कुछ क़ीमत होगी। वरना ड्रास्ट्रिक या कुछ भी कह कर छोड़ दीजिये तो उस से काम नहीं होगा।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): It is clear that by this Bill, we are legalising an illegality. Under the statute as it was in operation, notifications could not be passed after the 1st of March. 1952, but we understand levies were made, and they have been collected. They were not authorised collections. For four months, this illegal collection has gone on from 1st March.

Look at the way in which this Bill has been brought out. On the 12th July we find the Minister signing the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Have any notifications been issued after 1st of March?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: None.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No notification has been issued after the 1st of March. The original notification only wanted to prolong the period.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Even then the notifications ceased to have effect on the 1st day of March, 1952. Therefore, the collections which have been made under those notifications are illegal collections. There is no doubt about it. They are unauthorised.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Illegality may be committed in two ways. A new notification may be issued after 1st of March. The old notifications, though they have ceased to be in operation, may still be kept in operation as if they are valid and taxes collected. I think the hon. Member was referring to the other one, that even after the 1st of

March new notifications have been issued. That does not appear to be so.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Collection under any notifiaction after the 1st of March would be illegal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is another matter.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Under section 4A. sub-section (1) as it stands now, it is clearly an emergency power. You are saying here that where it is necessary to take immediate action, then the Central Government can issue a notification, directing a temporary amendment to be made. I submit the word "temporary" is very important. It preserves the power of Parliament; although you are delegating power to the executive, that delegation is restricted, not unregulated. That word should be there so that the power of the executive should be subject to the higher authority of Parliament. And, therefore, I am submitting that there should be no change effected there. The word "temporary" should be kept. Otherwise, it will be an uncanalised delegation, unregulated delegation to the executive. It will be an improper delegation, and that will be really an inroad on the powers of Parliament as my friend has stated already.

11 A.M.

I am supporting Mr. Bhargava's suggestion that in sub-section (3) of section 4A, "1952" should be made "1953" so that the notifications will continue to have effect till the 1st of March, 1953. Government's position will be regularised. They do not suffer, and at the same time, this unregulated, unrestricted delegation of authority will not be legalised. There is no difficulty because under the Constitution there is power to promulgate an Ordinance under article 123 during the recess of Parliament and you can have any legislation under that during the period when the House is not sitting and six weeks thereafter. Thereby, the whole position can be regularised, and there will be no difficulty if you retain the word "temporary" in section 4A, sub-section (1).

पंडित मुनीश्वर दत्त उपाध्याय (ज़िला प्रतापगढ़पूर्व) : यह ऐसा विषय है जिस पर मैं आवश्यक समझता हूं कि कुछ थोड़ा सा निवेदन करूं। जब जब यह विषय इस भवन के सामने आया तो इस विषय के एक पहलू पर हमेशा बहुत ज़ोर दिया गया कि पार्लियामेंट के अधिकार सरकार को न दिये जायें और यह कि इस तरह से अधिकार दे देने के पश्चात् बहुत सी दिक्कतें पड़ सकती हैं और कभी कभी उस अधिकार का दुरुपयोग भी हो सकता है। लेकिन फिर कोई रास्ता न निकाला जाये तो बहुत सी दिक़्क़तें सरकार के सामने भी आती थीं अगर इस तरह का अधिकार न दिया तो हमेशा फिर यही सूरत रह जाती थी कि सरकार कोई न कोई बिल (bill) लायें, विधेयक पार्लियामेंट के सामने लाये और उस को पास कराये। इस तरह काम करने में बड़ी दिक़्क़त पड़ सकती है। उस कठिनाई को दूर करने के लिये जब जब यह प्रश्न हमारी सरकार के सामने आया तो कोई न कोई रास्ता निकालने की कोशिश की गयी, जैसा कि हम ने रिपोर्ट में भी देखा और जिस का हवाला भी दिया गया।

लेकिन अब यह जो अधिकार मांगा जा रहा है मैं समझता हूं कि इस तरह का अधिकार दे देना उचित नहीं होगा और मैं अपने जो अन्य माननीय मित्र हैं उन से सहमत हूं कि इस सम्बन्ध में थोड़ा सा प्रतिबन्ध होना आवश्यक है। वह प्रतिबन्ध समय का हो सकता है। इस लिये सब से आसान चीज़ जो इस में हो सकती है वह यह है कि, जैसा भार्गव जी ने तजवीज़ किया, बजाये सन् १९५२ के वह सन् १९५३ कर दी जाये। इस में कोई दिक़्क़त भी नहीं होगी, कोई बाधा नहीं होगी। सब-सैक्शन ३ में बजाय सन् १९५२ के सन् १९५३ कर दिया जाये। इतने से ही काम बन सकता है। जैसा कि चैटर्जी साहब ने फ़रमाया उस लेहाज से भी यह आवश्यक है कि इस तरह का अधिकार सरकार को रहे। वरना जैसी दिक़्क़त उन्होंने बताई और जो सन्देह उन्होंने प्रकट किया वह हो सकता है कि चार महीने से बिला किसी अधिकार के वसूलयाबी हो रही

[पंडित मुनीश्वर दत्त उपाध्याय]

हैं। यह बहुत सन्दिग्ध प्रश्न है कि इस के यह माने लगाये जा सकते हैं। परन्तु तो भी ऐसा प्रश्न काहे को उठे ? अगर हम रास्ता यही रखें कि पार्लियामेंट के सामने क़ानून बन कर आवे तभी वसूलयाबी हो सके और इस पर कार्यवाही की जा सके तो मैं समझता हूं कि वह बड़ा कठिन रास्ता है और उस में हमेशा अड़चनें और दिक़्क़तें पड़ा करेंगी। उन अड़चनों से बचने के लिये और ऐसे सन्देह से बचने के लिये जैसा कि चटर्जी साहब ने अभी हाउस के सामने निवेदन किया मैं समझता हूं कि आवश्यक यह है कि अधिकार तो ज़रूर दिया जाय लेकिन उस अधिकार के देने में समय का वह प्रतिबन्ध रखा जाय जो कि तजवीज़ किया गया है। और एक थोड़े से संशोधन से हमारा काम हल हो जाता है और वह संशोधन, जैसा मैं ने निवेदन किया, यह है कि सिर्फ़ ५२ को ५३ कर दिया जाय।

एक तजवीज़ और भी हमारे सामने आई है। मैं समझता हूं कि अगर उस का कोई तरीक़ा निकल सके तो बड़ा सुन्दर है। इस से पूरे तौर पर वह मतलब तो नहीं निकलता है, लेकिन ऐसे मामलात, ऐसे प्रश्न प्रायः हमारे सामने, इस भवन के सामने, आ जाया करें और उन के प्रसंग में जो त्रुटियां हुआ करती हैं उन त्रुटियों पर हम विचार करके संशोधन कर दिया करें, उन के बारे में इस भवन की राय प्रकट हो जाया करे तो आसानी से सुधार हो सकता है और मेरी समझ में जो बड़ी बड़ी ग़लतियां अक्सर हो जाती हैं और यह कोई नयी बात नहीं है, उनका भी सुधार होता जाय और आयन्दा के लिये, ऐसी ग़लतियों के लिये, लोग सचेत होते जायें। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि यह अधिकार देना आवश्यक है, उस तरमीम के साथ जो कि भार्गव जी ने उपस्थित की है।

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): May I make a few observations?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Evidently the hon. Member gathers momentum after many other hon. Members have spoken.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: May I express my gratitude for the support from a quarter where support is not usually given, namely the support given to me by my hon. friend, Dr. Mookerjee. I only wish that in extending that very generous support, he need not have twisted the tail of it and wanted me to restrict the scope of this measure to a limited period.

One question was asked by my hon. friend, Mr. More for which I shall give the answer. I think the question he asked should be posed in this manner. Supposing the House do not agree to the passing of this measure, what will be the loss that Government will incur? It will be in the region of about one crore and 63 lakhs of rupees.

It has been mentioned that there is a great laxity on the part of Government.

Shri S. S. More: Will the hon. Minister mention the particular duties from which this income has accrued?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have some figures regarding vegetable oils and oil-seeds, groundnuts and cloth. This represents the total dues collected on them. The same duties could be collected irrespective of action taken under section 4A and therefore the net loss and the amount that would have to be refunded, if this Bill is not passed would be in the region of Rs. 163 lakhs.

It has been suggested that there has been laxity on the part of the machinery of Government. It cannot be denied. I am quite willing to accept the responsibility; though it does happen that the carrying through of this measure happens to fall within the scope of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, the actual administration of the duties is in another Ministry altogether. It is true that this matter has been missed and it is very difficult to say exactly who is responsible. Very possibly we the Government are responsible because we accept a provision of the nature that has been put in sub-section (3) of section 4A, a provision which limited the period of the operation of that particular clause. It has no real bearing either to the

financial year or to any other category excepting that it is an *ad hoc* day. I am not disclaiming responsibility. It does not matter as to who is responsible, whether it is my Ministry or the Revenue Division of the Finance Ministry. It is the responsibility of the Government and I certainly (*An Hon. Member*: Collective responsibility) accept the responsibility. I do not propose to deny that somebody else has not lost sight of it, and whether it is a Minister or somebody else, the House is not concerned with the matter, so long as I accept the responsibility.

On the second question, a reference was made by my hon. friend, Mr. Bansal about something that I had said. Mr. Bansal is rather new to the House and therefore he has misquoted something that I had said. It was in relation to levy of protective duties by executive order. I should like to draw a very important distinction between levying protective duties either for revenue purposes or protective purposes without a proper examination and levying export duties where a consumer in this country is not affected, but where it is for the purpose of correcting an economic evil.

Shri Bansal: It is not a question of 'without proper investigation' because the import duties are levied after the report of the Tariff Commission. I am not mis-quoting at all. I was reading out from the proceedings and this cannot be called mis-quoting. I seek the protection of the Chair on that matter.

Secondly, does the hon. Minister imply that he cannot be quoted on any occasion? It is not necessary that he should be speaking on the same subject in the previous year. It was a matter of principle that was being discussed on the floor of this House and the principle was whether the executive can pass...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Minister is no new Parliamentarian. He is practically as old as this House and he knows quite well what can be quoted. He had made a statement earlier and he is entitled to change as any other hon. Member. I do not find that any trouble arises here.

Shri S. S. More: Are we to take it that an old Parliamentarian commits no mistakes?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am sorry my young friend mistook me when the particular quotation was in regard to a Bill moved by my hon. friend on my left, which is for the purpose of protective duties and therefore it was that I said that the quotation was not quite germane. I was rather afraid that I might have spoken on this particular measure in 1950. I have a vague recollection that I was not very well at that time. But I realise that I had taken part in that discussion. I think it was a question of law which was dealt with by my hon. friend, Dr. Ambedkar, I remember having taken part in that particular discussion, but I think I was fairly careful not to say anything which could be used against me at the present moment, but that does not matter. Supposing I had said that, I can change my position. In any case I did not cast any reflection on the hon. Member but I only said that the point is not germane.

The question now hangs on one particular thing, namely, why should the word 'temporary' be removed. I am not a lawyer. (*An Hon. Member*: Thank God.) Perhaps one can thank God, but it is a different matter altogether as one looks at it. I often wish I had been one. (*Hear hear*) I am rather surprised that a jurist of the eminence of Mr. Chatterjee should intervene for the purpose of making clear a particular view which in my opinion does not seem either germane or tenable. He says that the word 'temporary' is very essential. But I cannot see how, because a delegation of authority can be made temporarily and not permanently. Of course, my hon. friend must know all about law and the delegation of powers. Yet, I do not see how it is anything but temporary. If the executive acts on this delegated authority and issues a notification imposing an export duty, it has to come to Parliament again. All the benefit that the executive will get will be the collection of duty made between the period of notification and the period when it comes to Parliament. Parliament can say "No, we would not allow you to do that; the notification should be rescinded". In my view, therefore, the temporary nature of the notification is maintained. Whether this power is given as a permanent part of the statute book or not, the action on the part of the executive is *per se* temporary. I am surprised, that an eminent jurist and lawyer should have said this.

Shri S. S. More: As in March 1952, in these two notifications, it is open to them to cancel or withdraw the

[Shri S. S. More]

notification, but until they do so, the notifications are automatically in force and they go on perpetually.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: What I am seeking to maintain is that if Parliament does not ratify the notification, then it disappears. So the action taken by Government is purely a temporary one.

Pandit A. R. Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East *cum* Ballia Distt.—West): What harm is there if you keep the word 'temporary' in the Bill?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am coming to that point presently.

The second point mentioned by my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee is that the Government have powers under article 123, by which they can issue an Ordinance. I thought a lawyer and a former Judge of the High Court would rebel against the idea of an Ordinance. If we find out our mistakes, it is quite true that an Ordinance can be issued, even without this Bill. It is quite true that it is not necessary for us to have these powers at all, if we are going to resort to Ordinances. My hon. friend will also concede the point that for any action under article 123 of the Constitution, when Parliament disperses, it has to be prorogued, because for the issue of the Ordinance, it has not to be in session. This is a suggestion which a Government might ordinarily adopt, as it comes from a lawyer of such eminence as my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee. But as a person who is not a lawyer if I were on the other side of the House, I would not have made that suggestion, and I would not even have thrown the idea to the Government that instead of seeking powers to be vested in them by the express sanction of Parliament they should resort to an Ordinance, and for that purpose prorogue Parliament which might be in session.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Nobody likes any Ordinances.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Such an idea would shock my conscience if I were a lawyer. But it shocks me all the more even though I am not a lawyer. It is a different thing altogether. The lawyers see only the seamy-side of life and are therefore immune to these shocks that laymen like me are subject to.

The question really is this, namely whether the power that is given by the Bill should be limited to a period only or whether it should be a part of the statute-book permanently with the limitation that is imposed on it by the provisions of sub-section (2), which, in my view, is a very effective limitation. On every issue, Parliament can deny the power asked for by the executive. The mischief that would be done by the executive will be limited to that period only, the period between the time the notification is issued, and the time it comes to Parliament. As has been mentioned in sub-section (2), it cannot be of a long duration. It is a question for the House to decide.

My hon. friend Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand suggested that the date should be 1st March 1953. I cannot understand what is the particular sanctity about that date. If my hon. friend says that the times are now such that everything is normal and that trade is moving normally, that prices have not shot up, the world prices are on a par with Indian prices, and so there is no possibility of levying an export duty, I say this power is not necessary at all, for ever, it is only necessary for a period of six months, because I may have in mind the question of levying an export duty on one or two articles for some other purpose. But the world is not like that. I quite understand the opposition of my hon. friend Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand or of my friend Mr. Bansal. Their question is, what would happen if these powers are not there. The answer is that trade will make the money. For instance, I shall give you the prices of some commodities that were obtaining here and elsewhere, in the last week of June 1952:

Groundnut—Rs. 20/15/-per maund in India.
Rs. 48/2/- per maund in Singapore.

Linseed—Rs. 580/- per ton in India.
Rs. 974/- per ton in the U. K.

Castor Oil—Rs. 1120/- per ton in India.
Rs. 2150/- per ton in the U.K.
Rs. 4000/- per ton in Egypt.

Linseed Oil.—Rs. 1360/- per ton in India.
Rs. 1865/- per ton in the U.K.
Rs. 3105/- per ton in Ceylon.
Rs. 735/- per ton in Egypt.

Hon. Members from the Opposition have got such a soft corner for the trading community in the country that they feel that they should mop up this difference of price between what is ruling in India and what obtains elsewhere. I think by doing so, they are doing damage to the principles which they hold dear.

Shri S. S. More: No hon. Member from the Opposition suggested that there should not be any powers like that.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am always grateful, Sir, for small mercies, and I am very grateful to my hon. friend Mr. More who has said that the power must be given. I am wanting not merely an acquiescence in my demand, but I want support also from my hon. friend Mr. More that they will not permit, not only upto the end of 1st March 1953, but for ever any person in this country mopping up the difference between the prices that rule in India and those that obtain elsewhere. I want that kind of support from the Opposition.

Shri S. S. More: Not for ever. The question involved is that of granting powers to the executive Government, and we are opposed to that.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: My hon. friend cannot have the cake and eat it too If he wants that he must have the cake, he should not eat it.

For instance, if my hon. friend Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand—the hon. Member might forgive me if I am referring to him. I am only saying this by way of an example—comes to know that I am thinking of the levy of an export duty on some goods, he will probably try to corner them to send to some other country from India.

Shri Tulsidas: I am sorry that the hon. the Minister has quoted something, which it is not well of him to have done. I never said that the export duty should not be levied. I only said that the power to levy it should be there only for a temporary period, that the executive should not have this power for all time to come. That is exactly what I said. Why then refer to the question of prices ruling here and elsewhere. If the prices here are low and those elsewhere are higher, then export duty should be levied, otherwise you cannot solve the problem.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister evidently means that if the power is nut granted in an emergency, but is limited only to 1953 or 1954, what is to happen after that period. Emergencies need not be confined only to two years.

Shri Tulsidas: The period can be extended.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister is quite right in saying that so far as the Government interests are concerned, they are interested in seeing that the difference in prices is mopped up and taken over by Government. It must be there to cover the emergencies. There is no quarrel about that. It is equally right on the part of the hon. Minister to have said that otherwise the difference will only go into the pockets of the industry or trade. Hon. Members may refute his argument, but they have now lost their chances. If the chance arises later, let the hon. Members continue their arguments.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): When points of order are being raised, hon. Members are only opposing the explanation given by the hon. Minister. I wish that you will make it clear when any Members of my own party or the so-called Opposition here raise points of order, they should try to explain their grounds over the point of order.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The hon. Member is raising a point of advice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not digress. By whatever name it might be called, the hon. Member wants to clear up some doubt, in this way. Let me not be strict in these matters.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I do not want to get side-tracked. I merely stated an example. I know that my hon. friend is not interested in oil or anything like that. So it is not a question of mentioning it at all. The point really is this that this limitation that is sought to be laid is a meaningless limitation because the limitation is already existing there. If tomorrow the Government imposes an export duty on a particular article and then issues a notification for that purpose and then comes to Parliament and Parliament says: "No, we will not give you the power", that is the end of it. As I said, the restriction is only for a very short time and whether you say that you want to restrict this power or not, the totality of the power until 1953 or 1954 or 1955, the restriction can be exercised by Parliament at every stage and in every individual instance. As I said, I can only feel that acceptance of this amendment in 1950 limiting it to 1st March 1952 has merely brought us into a rather unpleasant predicament of one Ministry

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

having to move it, another Ministry having to execute it, and somebody in between losing sight of the thing, and legal opinion being given that unless the Bill is brought again to Parliament and Parliament passes it, the position cannot be covered. It is merely to avoid a contingency of this nature that this step is taken and the powers of Parliament are not abridged in any way. You do not add to the power of Parliament by saying that it will only operate until 1953 or 1954. In any event, I cannot accept an amendment of the nature proposed by the hon. Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand that this should be limited to 1953. In fact, experts tell us there is a slump in the offing, economic disturbances possibly in the offing and therefore, Government feels in these circumstances that...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That may be so with respect to future notifications. When future notifications are made, they have to be placed before Parliament and its approval obtained. Then it is open to Parliament to modify or even to restrict its operation. But with respect to those two notifications the life of which is sought to be prolonged, Parliament, except on this occasion, will not have a say so far as its operation is concerned. That is why I think the Opposition is now trying to restrict it.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: What we require now in respect of these four commodities is something altogether different. It is not permanent. It is only for a lapse on the part of the Government which we want Parliament to condone.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But it will have its operation also in future.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It will continue. As a matter of fact, mere condonation of that lapse on the part of Government will allow it to continue.

The other question—I think some hon. Member raised it—is that of the wording of sub-section (3) of section 4A which appears in clause 2(b)—why this? Why should the Government reduce the duty or vary it? As I said, the powers are already there under section 21 of the General Clauses Act. Then section 23 of the Indian Sea Customs Act gives power to the Government to reduce duties whenever they like. They can exempt; they can reduce. The powers are there already, even in respect of duties which are revenue duties in which the House is vitally interested as custodians of the interests of the consumers. Here, as I said, people in this country are not interested except in business, to make a little more money if you do not put export duty. The consumer is not affected. What we propose to do is to use an economic corrective and it will be perfectly open to the House on the occasion when I come before it or my hon. colleague, the Finance Minister comes before it, to refuse to ratify. Government will think twice before they move further in the matter. But there is no question of now ascertaining anybody's opinion because the matter has got to be dealt with immediately, and that point has been very ably made out by my hon. friend, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. This is a matter in which Government cannot hestitate. It has got to be executive action; it cannot be any other action, because secrecy is vital in a matter like this and therefore, it cannot be helped.

Secondly, the question of temporariness. It is temporary. You can reject the resolution ratifying the notification. I can assure the hon. Members of this House that if on occasions the House indicates that it does not like governmental action, the Government will be chary of issuing any notification of this nature. This will be only for a period to cover an emergency. Nobody suggested to Government that they should reduce the export duty. We are losing trade, we are losing vital foreign exchange. So we reduced it to half and then further. I mean it is not a question of anybody suggesting to Government that it is lower. We lose vital foreign exchange and industry will suffer. Government is fully conscious of the needs of varying its attitude in a matter like this. Therefore, I humbly suggest that this safeguard, as it might seem to limit the operation of section 4A to any particular period, is unnecessary, because the safeguard is already provided and any action taken by Government would only be temporary even if the word 'temporary' is taken away because the powers can only be for an emergency period used for an emergency. It will not become a permanent part of the statute-book unless the emergency continues to exist in regard to that particular trade. I, therefore, humbly submit that in this position, we have been—it is a case of once bitten twice shy-bitten by this rather funny or curious limitation of the application of this particular section until the 1st March 1952 and we are now in this position of having to apologize to the House for condonation of something that we have done. Therefore, I do not want this thing to be repeated and I can assure hon. Members that the interests of the people will be safeguarded and there is not an iota of the control of Parliament that will be taken away. Everytime we have to come to you for ratification. It has to be approved by Parliament which is a sovereign body or refused by them. I hope in view of the explanations that I have offered and in view of the fact that fundamentally between the attitude of the bulk of the Members of this House and that of the Government there cannot be any divergence in regard to the necessity of a measure of this nature, the House will accept the motion that I have moved.

Pandit A. R. Shastri: You have excellently explained.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are no amendments except the one tabled by Shri Tulsidas Kilachand, notice of which was received at 9-55 a.m. this morning. Now the practice in the House is that unless the Minister in charge of the Bill is agreeable to accept the amendment...

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have indicated that I am not agreeable to accept it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then should the notice be waived?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Sir, this has come as a surprise to us. How is it possible to give notice without studying the Bill?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Was it not in the agenda of yesterday?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: No one knew until this morning that this was coming up today. Yesterday we adjourned when the Bill under discussion was the Indian Tea Control (Amendment) Bill. Today the order of business is altered.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If this Bill was not in the agenda yesterday...

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: May I make a humble suggestion to the Chair, that I should personally not object to the matter being voted upon? Only I will not accept the amendment. It is for the Chair to accept it or not to accept it, subject to the considerations that exist and so far as I am concerned, I am not suggesting that the Chair should rule it out. I have only indicated that. Government cannot accept it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It cannot be expected that the Tea Control (Amendment) Bill would have taken the whole day. If this was already on the order paper yesterday......

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): This was introduced only a few days ago.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It was introduced day before yesterday and it was put in the Supplementary List and very possibly, Sir, the hon. Member did not have time to notice it.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: There could be no time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find the Bill was introduced only on the 14th. That is all. Though sufficient notice ought to have been given...

Shri Karmarkar: The agenda was circulated day before yesterday. It does not matter. We have no objection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is another matter. I will waive the notice. I do not think hon. Members can be expected to have tabled their amendment earlier.

Clause 2.—(*Amendment of section 4A etc.*)

Shri Tulsidas: I beg to move:

In page 1, for lines 8 to 13, substitute:

> '(b) in sub-section (3), for the figures "1952" the figures "1953" shall be substituted.'

That means the whole clause goes and in sub-section (3) instead of "1952", it becomes "1953".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then I shall place the amendment before the House.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Before you do so, Sir, I might mention one thing. I do not know if it would fit in actually in that form.

Shri Tulsidas: I would like to make a few observations on this amendment. My amendment almost retains the previous sub-section (8), only "1st day of March, 1952" becomes "1st day of March, 1953".

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: It almost negatives the whole Bill.

Shri Tulsidas: It does not negative the whole Bill. My point in putting in "1st day of March, 1953" is this. And here I would like the hon. Minister to understand that I am not against any increase in or levying of export duties. In fact, if I may remind him, in the Export Advisory Council meeting in the year 1951 it was I who suggested to the Government to impose export duties. It took at least six months before Government took a decision to impose export duties. It is no use saying that the business community as a whole is not in favour of export duties. I am really surprised to see that the remarks which the hon. Minister has made have gone against the business community. The business community has played its part; it had given warning a long time before that export duties should be imposed but the Government had not done so till six months after when the full damage was done. And it is now being assumed that the business community does not want export duties!

There is another aspect also. In abnormal times there should be export duties but when the times return to normalcy those export duties should be removed. In normal times the export duties do not come from the pockets of the foreign buyer but from the pockets of our own producer. That is a factor which must not be forgotten. The export duty then comes from the pocket of the producer because the price he receives from the foreign buyer is so much and not anything more and the export duty is therefore taken from the producer. I can understand the imposition of export duties in abnormal times because then they come from the pocket of the foreign buyer. I am prepared to convince the hon. Minister on this point even from the point of view of economic theories.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nobody here says that in normal times you must have an export duty.

Shri Tulsidas: Therefore, I come to the point. In normal times export duties have to be removed because otherwise the prices of those commodities will remain very high. We see at present a trend towards normality and I hope at some stage we must reach normal times. If on the 1st day of March, 1953 the abnormal times still remain the hon. Minister can certainly come forward with the suggestion that the period should be extended for a year or two. I do not mind that. The point is we must have certain ceiling in this matter, so that when normal times do come we should not continue the export duties. That is a fact which I would like the hon. Minister as well as the House to take note of, because in normal times the export duty has to come out of the pocket of your own producer. Before I conclude, I would also like to repeat that the suggestion that the business community has always not liked the imposition of export duties is not correct.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 1, for lines 8 to 13, substitute:

> '(b) in sub-section (3), for the figures "1952" the figures "1953" shall be substituted.'

Shri Karmarkar: The merits of the question have already been gone into by my senior colleague. I would just like to add one reason why we want this amendment in the present form. I was unable to appreciate the apprehension on the other side because every notification, either reducing or increasing the duty, has to come before Parliament. We are very particular about that point. My hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava knows very well how almost impractical a time-limit of seven or fourteen days would be, and how difficult it would be of operation. We are of the view that in practice in a sovereign Parliament where Government is responsible to Parliament to have any such artificial limitations would be unnecessary but we accepted that in order to satisfy the House. This amendment which we have before us now is very well-advised inasmuch as every notification imposing an export duty has to come before Parliament and Parliament can by way of resolution either confirm or modify every such duty. It is hardly necessary to have the limitation here. In fact, a limitation here would harm the sovereignty of Parliament in a sense. What we are concerned here is a statute. (*Interruption*) My hon. friend, Dr. Syama Prasad who is far senior to me may listen to me for a moment. This is a statute which you cannot change unless you introduce an amending Bill. Even after approval of a notification if Parliament feels that the notification should have continued effect even after the date specified in the notification, Parliament cannot in the course of a resolution make an amendment to the statute. Assuming for a moment that Parliament does feel that in a particular case it would serve the interests of the country to keep everyone full informed and not keep anyone—neither the producer at home nor the buyer abroad—in suspense about the need to continue the duty say, up to 1st day of March, 1954, Parliament cannot by a resolution achieve its object. It shall have to do it by way of an amendment to the statute in respect of that particular duty. Therefore, we have here a double protection.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Has Government ever announced that a duty will be imposed from a particular date to another date? Has not Government the right to change it at any time?

Shri Karmarkar: The point that I was making was this. The executive here has been given a seemingly wide power but there is no generosity about that power inasmuch as every notification has to come before the House either for approval or for modification. We have been charged with frequent changes in our export duties: Once you put up an export duty, then you lower it, then you again increase it—that has been alleged and rightly in some respects. There is always an advantage in having a steadiness about these duties, and it does not give any advantage to the country to say that after all any notification issued on the 1st January, 1953 has to expire on the 1st March, 1953. It does not do any good to the country at all. Parliament has supreme right to make any modification it chooses whenever any particular notification comes into operation. It can say, "This duty will remain in operation for one year, six months, or two years or for ever". Every notification has to come before Parliament and in view of that provision I am quite sure in my mind that this objection to giving Government the general power is absolutely unfounded. Therefore, we oppose the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 1, for lines 8 to 13, substitute:

> '(b) in sub-section (3), for the figures "1952" the figures "1953" shall be substituted.'

The motion was negatived.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

INDIAN TEA CONTROL (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yesterday when I was about to put the consideration motion, some hon. Member raised a point of order and I gave my ruling. I shall now put the motion.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tea Control Act, 1938, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2.—(*Amendment of Section 3 etc.*)

Shri P. T. Chacko (Meenachil): I beg to move:

In page 1, line 8, for "such period as may be prescribed" substitute "a period of two years from the date of nomination or election."

My object is that instead of leaving it to the executive to fix the period, we may limit the period by legislation itself.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): The Act itself will expire in 1955. The total period within which the executive can fix the tenure of this Committee is only three years. I have not made up my mind whether we should extend it by one year or two years. I would rather that it is left to the executive to decide. I am unable to accept the amendment.

Shri P. T. Chacko: I do not press my amendment.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4.—(*Substitution of new section for section 26 etc.*)

Shri P. T. Chacko: I beg to move:

In page 1, line 22, for "also" substitute "not".

[Shri P. T. Chacko]

The Statement of Objects and Reasons says:

> "Under section 26 of the Act, the permission of the Tea Licensing Committee is not required for the replacing of tea areas by planting tea on areas not planted with tea to the same extent but not exceeding 2 per cent. in each year of the total permissible acreage of the tea estate as on the 31st day of March, 1950. It is now considered necessary for the purpose of ensuring strict observance of our obligations under the International Tea Agreement that this matter also should be subject to the permission of the Tea Licensing Committee."

As per the provisions of the International Tea Agreement, "it shall be permissible to replace areas of land forming part of the permissible acreage by planting with tea of areas to the same extent on ground not planted with tea, such replacements to be limited to a maximum of five per cent". So, our obligation is only to this extent. We are allowed to replace five per cent. of the permissible acreage of tea by uprooting plants from land to the same extent. I cannot understand why we should take away this authority from the planters and vest it in another body. In these times, due to pests and droughts, plants die away, and in some cases when the dead plants are removed and fresh ones planted, they would not grow in the same land. Therefore, it is necessary for the planter to replace the tea in fresh area. Of course, now he can do so to the extent as is permitted under the International Tea Agreement. I only want that the existing law should continue and this would be the effect of my amendment, if it is accepted. I request the hon. Minister to consider the matter and if possible accept my amendment.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If the position be as the hon. Member has stated, then I would never have brought my amendment to section 26. He says, "You have considered it. But you have done it wrongly. Accept that you have done it wrongly." Well, even as it is, the permission of the Tea Licensing Board is obtained by planters for purposes of replacement and the extent of replacement is limited by the Agreement to two per cent. every year and a total of ten per cent. for a period of five years from March 1950 to March 1955. This provision merely regularises it. Planters have been obtaining licences before and they should obtain licences, so that the Tea Licensing Board will have some check on what is being done. My hon. friend says "No, I do not accept that position." Well, if he does not accept it, I cannot convince him. I think this provision is very necessary and forms an integral part of the Bill. I am unable to accept the amendment.

Shri P. T. Chacko: May I know whether even for replacements to the extent of two per cent. mentioned in the existing Act the permission of the Tea Licensing Board is necessary at present?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Actually and in practice, it is being asked and is being given, so that the Tea Licensing Board may exercise some check as to whether it is only two per cent. that is planted or whether more is planted. It is for that purpose that by convention prior permission is obtained. If you are going to keep within the four corners of the Agreement, that kind of provision is necessary, and that is why we have now made it a legislative liability.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): If this is not brought under the Tea Licensing Board, what harm will be done? He referred to some harm.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If I accept my hon. friend's language no harm would be done if anything happens.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): I think it is time the Government of India examined the International Tea Agreement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He said it is constantly under review.

Shri P. T. Chacko: I do not press my amendment.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

RUBBER (PRODUCTION AND MARKETING) AMENDMENT BILL

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to move:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, be taken into consideration."

This is a non-controversial measure and has been brought in response to a request made by the Government of Madras. They now have one representative on the Rubber Board and have asked for augmentation of that representation to two. The request is an old one and has been constantly under review. Government felt that they would have to review the whole Act and may incorporate the request at the time of the revision of the Act. At the present time there is no possibility of the Act being reviewed. So the amendment has been brought forward in order to provide for the representation of the Government of Madras on the Board being increased to two members.

Care has also been taken to see—as the House will find—that out of the two members to be nominated by the Government of Madras, one shall be an official and the other a non-official. Therefore, the non-official interest is also being safeguarded. I hope the House will accept this measure without much discussion because it does not really involve any principle or departure from the existing constitution of the Rubber Board.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, be taken into consideration."

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): I have one appeal to make to the hon. Minister. He says that he has made provision for the nomination of one non-official. But it has always been the case that in such matters labour is never consulted, nor any representation given to it. This is my grievance. Whatever be the industry, whether it is the rubber industry or tea industry, if it is to improve and serve the interests of the people, labour must have a voice in it. Therefore, in an industry of such magnitude as rubber......

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I might inform the hon. Member that on the Board there are three representatives of labour to be nominated by the Central Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that this Bill seeks to do is to amend the section in order to enable the Government of Madras to nominate two representatives, instead of one. Independently there is a clause which provides for representation of labour to be nominated by the Central Government.

Shri Nambiar: There comes the trouble. If the Central Government...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are going to another point. The Bill does not relate to the section dealing with representation for labour. The hon. Member should, therefore, confine himself to the scope of the Bill.

Shri Nambiar: I will not take much time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not a question of his taking much time. It is a question of the proceedings being relevant.

This amendment seeks to increase the representation of Madras to two. It is open to the hon. Member to say that one of them should go to labour.

Shri Nambiar: If he gives one of the two to labour, I shall be grateful.

12 NOON

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): I wish to make a few observations on this amending Bill. The object of this Bill is to strengthen the representation of the Madras Government on the Indian Rubber Board. Now, when we are asked to add to the strength of the Rubber Board we are entitled to know from Government what exactly has been the attitude of Government, or the approach that Government has made, to the recommendations of the Rubber Board.

The original measure was enacted for the development under Central control of the rubber industry as regards production, marketing and regulating of rubber. In Travancore-Cochin which has 132,604 acres out of a total acreage of 162,147 under rubber throughout India, an impression has gained ground that Government is not quite alive to the interest of the producers and that the interest of the manufacturers are more in the eyes of the Government than the interest of the producers.

In answer to a question tabled in the course of the present session of Parliament, the hon. Minister of Commerce replied that the price of imported rubber per hundred pounds is Rs. 304/13/-, while for Indian pro-

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

duced rubber only Rs. 128 for hundred pounds is being paid. This disparity in price cannot be understood.

It is not for lack of representation on the Board. As it is, out of 26 persons on the Board, the Government of Travancore-Cochin is given five persons; the United Planters' Association of South India has three members; the Rubber Growers' Association of Kottayam has got three persons and the Association of Planters in Kottayam are given three persons. From this it will be found that the producers' interests have been more in the mind of Parliament when this measure was enacted. Even then, my complaint is that the producers' interests have not been borne in mind by the Government.

The margin of profit for the manufacturer is much in excess of that for the grower. To illustrate my point, the price of the quantity of raw rubber contained in a motor car tyre...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How are these points relevant to the discussion.

Shri A. M. Thomas: As I understand it, the object of Government in seeking to add to the strength of the Board, to give more representation to the Madras Government, is to see to the interests of the producers, because South India is the area where most of the rubber in India is produced. Therefore, I believe that it is perfectly relevant when I discuss the principle underlying the constitution of the Rubber Board.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Of course, the hon. Member may say that the Board would become unwidely, or that the Government of Madras has not played its part. But to go into the price of rubber, etc., is beyond the scope of the Bill.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): This is a debate on rubber and it ought to be more elastic.

Shri A. M. Thomas: My suggestion is that it is not enough if proper representation is given on the Board or more representation is given to the Government of Madras, but that Government must also be aware of the recommendations of the Board.

Having regard to the history of how Government has treated the recommendations of the Board, my submission is that Government is not alive to the interests of the producers. And I would urge on the Ministry of Commerce that even with the present strength of the Board the recommendations of the Board have to be given more weight and the interests of the producers have to be borne more in mind.

With these few words I support the Bill.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): I did not intend to intervene in the debate but for a remark which the hon. Minister of Commerce made in the course of his speech. He somewhat disturbed us. He said that he did not propose to review the Indian Rubber Control Act. That was his observation. I raised a point even yesterday that at the time when the Industries (Regulation and Development) Bill was under discussion his predecessor in office gave an undertaking that he would bring all the plantation products within the framework of the Industries (Regulation and Development) Bill by properly amending the specific statutes in respect of them. I do not know if the Commerce Minister, by the remark which he has fade, intends to give the go-by to the promise made to this House. We are very anxious that all the plantation products should be brought within the ambit of the Industries (Regulation and Development. Bill and for that purpose we are hoping that the Commerce Minister would take into consideration all these Acts, namely the Tea Control Act, the Central Tea Board Act. The Rubber Board Act, the Coffee Board Act etc. and see that as soon as possible they are brought in line with the Industries (Regulation and Development) Act.

Shri P. T. Chacko (Meenachil): I want to make only one observation. In 1949 when an amending Bill was moved in this House to this Act it was represented that in the Rubber Board there was no representation of the small growers. Then the Minister of Commerce and Industry at that time gave an assurance on the floor of this House that he would make the necessary amendments in the Act itself so as to ensure representation of the small growers. This assurance remains unfulfilled. Out of the total quantity of rubber produced in India I am sure, if not a major portion, a very good percentage of it is produced by small growers. Now in the Rubber Board there is absolutely no representation of the small producer. The effect is that whenever the Rubber Board makes any representation to the

Government, it is made to safeguard the interests of big planters and not the small growers. It may appear that the rubber producers were agitating for the last two or three years for enhancing the controlled price of rubber. But the small producer was always feeling that the representatives of the planters in the Rubber Board were not very sincere in approaching the Government. The controlled price of rubber was Rs. 90 per 100 lbs. of raw rubber, but even big firms which are running certain rubber industries in India were purchasing rubber at Kottayam for Rs. 130 to Rs. 148 per 100 lbs. So much so, if the managing director or the managing agent of a plantation company wanted to make a profit, he could simply sell the rubber at Rs. 90 to one of his own puppets and see that it is sold in the black market at Rs. 147—because in the company records he need show only Rs. 90 per 100 lbs. Thus, the small growers were always feeling that this Rubber Board was not doing anything to ensure the interests of the small growers. I only wanted to point out this matter to the hon. Minister so that he may take the necessary steps to ensure representation on this Board for the small growers.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): I Just want clarification on one point. I want to know why the Government of Madras wanted one more member and which interests this new member will represent.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As I said, it is an old story. The Government of Madras have been saying for nearly two years that they want larger representation because they want to have an official on the Board as the Madras Government's interests are connected with the work of the Board. And they would like also to have a non-official representative. That is the main reason and that is why it has been framed in this manner. I think it must satisfy my hon. friend Mr. Murthy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Government itself wants to have representation.

Shri B. S. Murthy: It is there. It has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that this did not adequately meet the needs of the Government of Madras. And they want one more representative. I want to know what are the needs of the Government of Madras, how they have been able to convince the Central Government that they should have one more representative, and what interests this new non-official member will represent.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a cerebral process which one has to undergo—getting the point of view of the Government of Madras and translating it into action by means of a Bill—it is rather difficult to explain. But the point is that the Government of Madras would like to have two representatives, one being a non-official and one an official. They want an official because they want to see that the interests of the Government of Madras are protected. Actually, as my hon. friend Mr. Thomas pointed out, the representation of Madras is next to nothing. And very possibly, the other representative from Madras might be a representative of the small growers, as Mr. Chacko put it.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): On a point of order, Sir. May I know whether the language "cerebral order" used by the hon. Minister is parliamentary and in order?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I said cerebral process. Even the question of taking in what the hon. lady Member says involves a cerebral process. I do not think it means anything.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I strongly object to that remark.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What the hon. Minister said was "I cannot explain the cerebral process". That is what he said.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, I said I cannot explain the cerebral process which I have undergone—not which *they* have undergone—and I am sure if any hon. Member wants to take in what I have said there must be a certain amount of cerebral process.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members have no objection to the hon. Minister's cerebral process.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: With regard to other matters, which you have very rightly ruled as not being relevant, I would say this that merely because we have brought in this Bill it does not mean that the Government are completely unalive to the need of looking into all these measures, to streamline them and, as Mr. Venkataraman suggested, to bring them within the scope of the Industries (Regulation and Development) Act. I am not disclosing a secret when I mention to the House that I have a file on my table reminding me every day of all the Acts which we are supposed to

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

administer. Because, I do find there are some lacunae, the Government is not able to exercise its supervision properly, and some changes are necessary. And I do hope that when I come with piecemeal amendments of these legislation the House will be equally tolerant to me and allow those pieces of legislation to be passed.

With regard to the points raised by my hon. friends Mr. Thomas and Mr. Chacko, it is not that I am unalive to the position of the rubber industry in our country. But, they must also recognise that there was a time prior to 1948 when owing to price fixing and the protection that we gave to rubber they were getting higher prices than the prices in Malaya. The price quoted by my hon. friend Mr. Thomas in regard to Malayan rubber is not what it is today, because prices have gone down. Nonetheless, I do recognise that what is given to our rubber producer is not adequate. Though I cannot make any promise—there is no point in my making promises galore and not keeping them up—I can certainly assure my friends that the matter is engaging the attention of Government. There has been a reference to the Tariff Commission in regard to the price of rubber and we expect a report from them before long. The matter will be considered and the Government will do everything that is possible subject to other over-riding considerations to see that the rubber interests are provided. I do not think there is any need for me to say anything more except to say that so far as the Bill is concerned, there is not much to be said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 and 2 were added to the Bill.

The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I beg to move:

> "That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

INDIAN COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to move:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Indian Companies Act, 1913, be taken into consideration."

The object of this Bill is to amend section 91B of the Indian Companies Act. I shall not read out the whole of the section; but, in essence, that section prohibits a director of a public company from voting in any board meeting of the company on any contract or arrangement in which he is either directly or indirectly concerned or interested. The principle underlying this Bill is obvious, and that is, to avoid any conflict of the personal interests of the director with the interests of the company on the board of which he is sitting. Although it is a salutary principle, its rigid application is likely to give rise to practical difficulties in certain circumstances. And these circumstances having arisen, we have brought forward this Bill. The urgent necessity for introducing some flexibility in the working of this provision has been brought about in connection with the recent agreements which the Government entered into with the Standard Vacuum Oil Company, The Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company Limited, and the Burmah Oil Company Limited for the setting up of modern Oil Refineries in India. One of the terms of the agreements was that these foreign companies were to form Indian companies under the Indian Companies Act in which they would hold ordinary shares and Indian investors will be given an opportunity to subscribe a portion of the capital in the form of cumulative preference shares. It is an essential feature of the arrangement that the said promoting companies should have a predominant voice in the management of the subsidiary companies to be formed here. In the normal course, it may be expected that they will be entering into various contracts with these subsidiary companies. Such an arrangement, it would be rightly seen, would be unworkable unless section 91B is amended because, as it stands at present, it will prevent the boards of the Indian companies from being really effective. The majority of the directors will be nominees of the Oil companies and therefore they will be directly interested in such contracts, that is to say, contracts with the parent company through their connection with those companies. Thus, the position has arisen that perhaps the public companies under the Indian Companies Act which were to be formed under the Agreements cannot be formed unless the present legal provision is relaxed. It is possible that similar difficulties may be experienced in other companies also.

It is in view of these circumstances and these possibilities, that the Company Law Committee has suggested a solution, and that is, that the proposed Central Authority for the administration of the Company law should have the power to exempt any company from the operation of the section if the Government informs the Central Authority that such exemption is in the public interest. That recommendation is contained towards the end of para 98 of the report at the top of page 73. It will take a considerable time before we are in a position to study in the first place, and then implement the recommendations of this Committee, and therefore it has become necessary to bring forward an interim measure to amend section 91B so as to vest the Central Government—it must be the Central Government in this case, not any Authority—with power to grant exemption from the operation of the section to public companies in suitable cases. The House will notice that the amendment leaves unaltered the substantive provision in the law which is based on a salutary principle, but only vests the Central Government with the power of exemption which is to be exercised by them only in respect of subsidiary companies where the public interest justifies such an exemption. So far as the particular Agreements with the Oil companies are concerned, Government are convinced, as my esteemed colleague, the Minister of Production said the other day, in the course of the Budget debate, that the setting up of an Oil Refinery industry on the Indian soil will be of considerable benefit to the Indian public and that is why we consider it advisable that the legal difficulties of the nature noticed should be removed by the Bill. I hope therefore that the House will accept the motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Indian Companies Act, 1913, be taken into consideration."

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): I am glad to hear a reference made to the Company Law Committee. But, I was sad to learn that the hon. Finance Minister is not yet ready to bring out a comprehensive amending Bill to the Companies Act. I hope steps will be taken to bring before the House at an early date a new Companies Act. It need not be called an amending Act, but a completely new Act under the sovereign Government of India. I have seen many reports; but that particular report on the future of the Companies Act is an excellent document from which I hope both the Government of India and ourselves will benefit and profit.

I support the Bill introduced by my hon. friend; but I would like to raise this point. Reference was made to three Agreements that we have entered into with the three foreign companies. I have not seen the Agreements. I shall some day examine the Agreements in another place and I will then form my own conclusions whether India has been hacked by these three foreign companies belonging to the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

The other day I drew the attention of the Production Minister to one point, and that is, that in the distant past some military official of the Defence Ministry of the then Government of India ruled that all benzol manufactured by any process by the Government factories and elsewhere will be sold to the Burmah Shell Co., at a profit of one anna per gallon and I had mentioned on the 18th last while I was speaking that if the Government of India is wise, we can produce our own security petrol. If that particular agreement could be traced in the Finance Ministry or anywhere in the Government of India—I hope, I am able to draw the attention of my friend the Finance Minister—then that ought to be removed—that particular gift which a certain Defence officer made to Burmah Shell. I am constrained to observe that it is most unfortunate that when the Government of India took over from the foreign Government, they never analysed the large number of documents and contracts which might go against our sovereignty. It has not been done.

Of course, I do not want to ask my friend the nature of the Agreements, but, to sum up, if it is possible for the Production Minister, let him bring those three Agreements for discussion. We are very chary of the foreigners. We are very suspicious of their habits. And if the Government of India works as a composite whole, they would have gone into the question of Burmah Shell making money out of India, bagging all the benzol manufactured by the Indian Companies or by the Government of India in their factories at one anna profit and Burmah Shell

[Shri B. Das]

making a profit of eight to ten annas per gallon. The whole object was foreign domination, so that Indian firms manufacturing benzol or petroleum by-products should not get the benefit.

Of course, we have never had a discussion of those three Agreements. The point is we have to have these Agreements over the Refineries in the present circumstances of India, but I want to know whether there is any clause in those Agreements which undermines our sovereignty, our independence, and which gives Burmah Shell or Caltex or the Standard Vacuum Oil Co., certain dominating authority over the Government of India in their economic policy or in the matter of defence. This I hope the hon. Finance Minister, and Production Minister and the others who negotiated the Agreements will examine with all its implications, and I would be very glad if my friend will assure the House even today that those Agreements are not contrary to the sovereignty of India, that those Agreements will not handicap us in time of peace or war, I am alive to the situation that if war starts, we will have in those Refineries, a certain amount of oil—crude oil and petrol. I am alive to it.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I do not want to see any foreign domination by any contract which the sovereign Government of India has entered into with any particular company outside India. And I am very much upset about the U.K. and the U.S.A. The U.S.A. is dominating every field of economic activity, and the dominating activities of the U.S.A. are very dangerous to India. We are peace loving. We want to know if there is any implication whereby these two U.S.A. companies will at any time dominate our freedom of action in matters of peace or war.

PRICES OF COARSE AND MEDIUM CLOTH

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the other matter—discussion on points arising out of answers given on the 17th June, 1952, to Short Notice Question No. 64 regarding "Prices of coarse and medium cloth".

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): I raised a Short Notice Question in the House about the rise in the prices of medium and coarse cloth effected in June last, and the reply was that this rise in prices was in accordance with the Tariff Board's recommendations. I read the Tariff Board's recommendations and found that this rise in prices was just against the very recommendations of the Tariff Board. The Tariff Board has recommended that the prices can be revised every quarter, having divided the year into four quarters. The first quarter was taken from January to March, the second from April to June, the third from July to September, and the fourth from October to December. The price can be revised in each quarter on the basis of the rise of price in cotton in the month preceding the quarter under review.

Now, in this case, the question arose for the second quarter, that is, the quarter beginning from April and ending with June. In April a review was taken, and the reply of the Government is that prices were not revised as there was some dispute over the cotton price, but ultimately in May the prices of coarse and medium cloth were reduced, and these were reduced in spite of the representation by the mill owners that they had purchased cotton at a higher price earlier. The very fact that the prices were reduced in May proves that the prices that were prevailing in the first week of March, 1952 were less, and that is also the reply. As time is very short, I will not go into all those things, but the very fact that these were reduced in May proves, and also Government admits, that prices of cotton were less, and because of the prices of cotton being less, the prices of cloth were reduced. I may refer to the reply of the hon. Minister also for ready reference here:

> "I accepted the Short Notice Question because there was a misapprehension in the minds of the public that the recent announcement of an increase of 0·7 to 2·59 per cent. in the price of cotton goods owing to increased manufacturing costs was an *ad hoc* increase in the prices of coarse and medium varieties. Actually, that is not the case. In May, prices were substantially reduced—as I said, from 5 to 24 per cent. Therefore, the reduction in the prices effected in May was substantial and that was due to the reduction in the price of cotton. In this case, the slight increase was due to the taking into account of the increased manufacturing costs, largely due to increased

wages and dearness allowance, and this increase happens to be almost a microscopic increase."

So, from this reply it is clear that the raising of the prices in June was not based on the increase in the price of cotton, but on the increase of the dearness allowance and manufacturing costs.

Then, I refer to the Tariff Board's recommendations. Those facts should only be taken into consideration when there is a question for revision of ex-mill prices of cloth. Reasons for increase they have divided into two items, *viz.*, cotton price and manufacturing costs. The Board says that cotton covers 70 per cent. of the cost of production of cloth, and manufacturing costs 30 per cent. The manufacturing cost consists of four items: wages, power and fuel, stores, overhead and other charges. The wages consist of nine per cent. of the total of 30 per cent., power and fuel seven per cent., stores seven per cent., and overhead charges seven per cent. So, the total is 30 per cent. The Board says the prices can be revised only when there is an increase of over ten per cent. in the wage level of the labourers and when there is over 50 per cent. increase in the power and fuel, and similarly 50 per cent. increase in stores. In the hon. Minister's reply it was said there was some increase in the wage level. We do not know whether there was any increase in the month of May or June in labour charges. There was none. A question was put by a lady Member of the House as to what had been the increase in the percentage of labour charges. The reply given was: "An inquiry was conducted by the Textile Commissioner attached to my Ministry and I think he has taken into account the increase in wages. Actually I have not asked him to work out these figures separately, but assuredly there has been a slight increase". According to the Tariff Board's recommendation there should have been no increase of prices in June. Then, there can be revision only once in a quarter, not twice. The prices were revised in May according to the Tariff Board's recommendation on the basis of prices that were prevailing in the first part of March 1952. They could not be revised even under the Tariff Board's recommendation for the quarter from April to June again. The prices could be revised only once but the prices were revised twice. Then we find that in the month of June, the prices were again revised and the prices have been increased for the third quarter from July to September with effect from 1st July 1952.

We find a news item on the 1st July 1952 as follows, "Cloth price revised". What we find in the quarter from April to June is that the prices of cloth have been revised three times, one in May—reduced—and another in June—increased—and the third increase again in June to take effect from 1st July. In the third quarter the prices could be revised on the basis of the increase in the cost of cotton and cost of manufacture etc. that were prevailing in the first week of June 1952. The hon. Minister in his reply on the 17th June said that there had been no increase in prices of cotton. I ask how could then there be increase in prices of cloth for the third quarter extending from July to September. What we find on 1st July is that there is a substantial increase in the price of medium, coarse and fine cloth. Whatever benefit was given to the poorer classes by a reduction of prices in May has been taken out of their hands by double increases of prices in June, and against this we find that a reduction has been given to superfine cloth. That reduction is also against the report of the Tariff Board. The Tariff Board on page 3 of its report says: "Whenever there comes a question..."

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has already taken nearly nine minutes. There will be no time for the hon. Minister to reply.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I would like to have two minutes more.

When the question of revising the prices comes up, between the coarse and fine cloth, what should be done? The price of coarse and medium cloth should not be increased but the price of superfine cloth should be increased by imposing a levy, so that we can make up for the loss and the poorer classes may not be adversely affected. Unfortunately the result has been otherwise. The price of superfine cloth has been reduced. It was reduced in the first quarter and then again reduced for the third quarter. On the other hand the prices of coarse and medium cloth were reduced in May and increased twice in June against the recommendations of the Tariff Board. I could prove to the House by reference to other documents that every step that had been taken had all been against the poor people, and in spite of the definite provisions of the Tariff Board's report. I would invite the hon. Minister's attention to the report of the Tariff Board in order to see for himself if the increase was in accordance with the Tariff Board's recommendations. The revision of prices has been undertaken by the Textile Commissioner and I do not

[Shri Sinhasan Singh]

know whether any independent body has been appointed by the Government for revision of prices. On page 41, paragraph 14 of the Tariff Board report, it is said that "if a periodical revision of prices is decided on by Government, we feel that such a revision should be entrusted to independent bodies". We do not know whether there is an independent body or not, but the hon. Minister has stated in his reply that the prices were revised by the Textile Commissioner on the basis of the prices that were prevailing in the first part of June. If there was any increase in the price on the basis of the prices in the 1st week of June, my point is that the prices should have been raised in July only and not in June.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Minister now explain the position with regard to the points raised. And then I shall call upon each hon. Member who wants to put a question. That is why I was asking the hon. Member not to make a long speech. This is a short discussion. So only the salient points need be put forward. The hon. Minister may briefly state his position. Then there are five people to whom I have to give time for putting forward their points.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari) This is not such a complex matter as the hon. Member has sought to make out. In fact I do not mind admitting that I tried to explain the position to him, but his mind is completely set. He has quoted something from the Tariff Board report. I have also read it, but I cannot come to the same conclusion as he has come to. He has quoted from page 3 of the Board's report. In 1948, the Textile Control Board had made certain suggestions before the Tariff Board—or as it is now called, the Tariff Commission—which have no validity today as they are old.

Again he has quoted, from page 41 of the Tariff Board report, their recommendations that if there is to be any revision in prices, a Committee should be appointed. I agree that this is the position. But if the revisions in prices are in terms of the recommendations of the Tariff Board by the adoption of what is called the realisation multiplier, then there is no need for any Committee.

There is one other misapprehension which my hon. friend seems to be labouring under. The recommendations of the Tariff Board are merely a guide for Government, and not in the nature of a law passed by Parliament which the Government cannot ignore or alter. The hon. Member seems to think that I have committed the most heinous sin to humanity, if I have felt that there could be a deviation from the position of the Tariff Board in regard to some of their recommendations.

The facts are as follows: I accepted the Short Notice Question of the hon. Member because as I said there is a certain amount of misapprehension, and certain newspapers also had written leading articles on the matter, saying that this Government is doing something which is wholly against the interests of the consumer because of a revision of prices ranging from 0·7 to 2·59 per cent. on certain types of cloth. It is merely because I thought I could dispel these misapprehensions, I accepted the Short Notice Question. But what seems to have happened is that it has added further to the confusion in the minds of people rather than cleared them. The position was this:

Under the usual procedure, the Textile Commissioner must have revised prices in terms of the formula given by the Tariff Board. At that time it was found that the cotton prices prevailing in the 1st week of March were practically not real, because there were really no transactions, and prices were dropping and were showing possibilities of coming down further. So in consultation with the industry it was felt that the prices should remain what they were for the quarter ending with March, and that the fixation could be done sometime later. In May, representations were made to the Textile Commissioner by the industry that they have been purchasing cotton at prices higher than those ruling at that time, and therefore if the prices were fixed on the basis of the prices ruling in the 1st week of a previous month, the industry would stand to lose. A suggestion was made by the Textile Commissioner with the approval of Government that the scheme of weighted averages could be adopted so that the prices of cotton may be equalised between the higher and the lower once, so that the consumer would not lose materially. But this suggestion was rejected by the Industry.

The Textile Commissioner had no other option except to declare the new prices on the basis of the Tariff Board recommendation using what is called the 'realisation multiplier' for the 15 categories mentioned by the

Tariff Board. And the prices were announced and it resulted in a substantial reduction in certain varieties of cloth. At that time the industry mentioned to the Textile Commissioner that wages had gone up, doubled, since 1948 and therefore, the manufacturing costs should be taken into account. According to the Tariff Board report, there should be a revision in respect of wages provided the cost exceeds ten per cent. Actually the increase has been 17·75 per cent. over the 1948 basis, and also there should be a revision in manufacturing costs if the cost of fuel and power had gone up by 50 per cent. This had not gone up whereas wages had gone up 17·75 per cent. over 1948. Therefore, it was obligatory on the part of Government whose representative the Textile Commissioner was to give that increase of 0·7 to 2:59 per cent.

The question comes, what should we do in July? Well in July the prices had to be declared, and we had to proceed on the basis of the prices ruling in the week ending 10th June. There is no question of a departure. If there had been a departure, the industry would have clamoured. Actually representations were made to me when I visited Bombay that we declare prices for the whole half year. But I did not feel quite safe. I thought probably the consumer would be affected because the prices were hardening even during the time of June. As many Members in the know of how cloth is made are aware, while in the case of coarse and medium and even in medium of less than 36 counts Indian cotton is being used, in fine and superfine varities and also in the case of medium containing more than 36 counts a certain element of foreign cotton comes and the prices of foreign cotton have been fluctuating enormously. American cotton, Egyptian cotton, East African cotton have all been going up and down and that explains that in the revision for the July-September quarter there have been variations. While the fine and the superfine have gone down, the more essention type of goods have gone up simply because of the component part in it of foreign cotton. That is the position. There is no question of hoodwinking anybody. After all there are two things. If the Textile Commissioner as the agent of the Government who works out the 'realisation multiplier' is to make any deviation, then the whole industry will be at him and the House will be hearing my hon. friend: Mr. Somani, giving the other side of the picture, how that industry has been neglected and badly treated by Government. And I thought it would have been much better for me to answer after Mr. Somani had spoken and the House would have said: "Here are two conflicting things. The Government is trying to do their very best". There has been no departure really from the Tariff Board formula. The Tariff Board's formula is not like the Laws of Medes of Persians. Government have a certain amount of latitude in this matter. After all, we have to think of the implications of the necessities of the time. I can assure my hon. friend that there is neither evasion, nor fraud nor attempting to cheat the consumer, but it is only the consumer's interest, subject to the claims of the industry that we are trying to safeguard. Government, I hope, on the whole have done very well by the consumer in this particular regard.

Shri G. D. Somani (Nagaur-Pali): Necessarily I have to confine my remarks to put a few questions arising out of the discussion that has taken place here. I would first like to ask the hon. Minister whether or not it is a fact that the mills were issued quotas of cotton at the commencement of the season and pressure was put upon the mills to purchase that cotton at the ceiling or at about the ceiling prices. It is all right that the Tariff Board formula was applied from 1st May, that the cotton prices as ruling in the first week of April were taken into consideration in fixing the prices from 1st May. But in view of the fact that the mills were virtually compelled to purchase their requirements of cotton at ceiling prices, obviously there was a departure from the Tariff Board formula which allows the mills to use their own discretion in making purchases of cotton. Because if the mills are allowed discretion they might benefit or they might not benefit and they might be right or wrong. But here when they were virtually compelled to purchase their cotton requirements at ceiling prices, then this Tariff Board formula should not have been applied.

I would also like to ask the hon. Minister another question. There is a Cotton Textile Control Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of Shri Morarji Desai, Chief Minister of Bombay, which consists not only of the representatives of the industry but of other interests as well. I would like to know whether that Committee made any recommendation about this question of cotton prices and whether Government implemented that recommendation which was made as a result of a decision taken by that Cotton

[Shri G. D. Somani]

Advisory Committee, I think, at its sitting on 27th May at Ahmedabad.

The next question I want to ask is this. Whatever slight increase was given to the industry from 1st June, was it long delayed or not? So far as I am aware the Tariff Board formula lays down, as the hon. Minister himself pointed out, that if the increase in manufacturing charges goes beyond a certain limit, that formula should automatically be applied by the Textile Commissioner in fixing the revision of prices for the quarter, but here it was done long after this rise in the manufacturing cost due to enormous increase in wages, dearness allowance, stores, fuel and so many other items—it was done after several months had passed and after several representations were made to the Government and even then it was not to the fullest extent of the increase that had taken place in the manufacturing cost. It only neutralised partially the increase in the manufacturing cost. So I would like the hon. Minister to enlighten the House on whether this increase was given long after the industry became entitled to it and whether in giving this increase certain other items like fuel, stores etc. were omitted due to some technical reason or the other.

Shri S. N. Das (Darbhanga Central): While we are not conversant with the Tariff Board formula and the way in which prices are fixed, we are concerned at the rising prices. We see that the poor people, especially the labour class, who have lost their purchasing power to a great extent find it very hard to purchase cloth. We also find that the labourers want higher wages, the mill-owners want higher profits, and the Government has to balance between the various interests concerned. Today the consumers and a very large section of the poor masses suffer to a very great extent. During our election tours we were confronted with all kinds of questions. In every village we visited we were told that every now and then prices of coarse and medium cloth are being increased and the people were going without cloth. Therefore, without going into the formula, I would just request the hon. Minister to find out ways and means whereby the large masses of people inhabiting India, especially the poor villagers, may be able to obtain coarse and medium cloth at a cheaper rate. If that is not possible, I would suggest to the Government that they should subsidise coarse and medium cloth in the case of labourers, especially landless labourers.

श्री रामजी वर्मा (जिला देवरिया—पूर्व): माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में जो जवाब दिया उस को मैं ने बहुत ग़ौर से सुना लेकिन मुझे इस पर दुःख हुआ कि उन्होंने यह कहा कि गवर्नमेंट टैरिफ़ बोर्ड (Tariff Board) की सिफ़ारिश मानने के लिये बाध्य नहीं है। यह ठीक है। एक दूसरे भाई ने भी कुछ जवाब दिया है। मालूम होता है कि कपड़े के बनाने वालों को, मिल वालों को, तो मौक़ा है कि वह अपने को गवर्नमेंट के सामने रिप्रेजेंट (represent) कर सकें लेकिन जनता की, कंज़्यूमर्स (consumers) की बात को कहने वाला कोई नहीं है। उन की बात सुनने के लिये अगर आप दो चार सदस्यों की कमेटी बना लेते तो अच्छा होता।

अभी हमारे ठाकुर सिंहासन सिंह ने कहा है कि कपास का दाम बढ़ा नहीं और चीज़ें बढ़ी नहीं, लेकिन कपड़े की क़ीमत दो दी मर्तबा बढ़ा दी गई। तो आप इस तरह से कपड़े की कीमत बारबार बढ़ाते जाते हैं और यह कहते जाते हैं कि ऐसा कोई क़ानून नहीं है जो कि हम को टैरिफ़ बोर्ड की सिफ़ारिशों को मानने के लिये बाध्य कर सके। ठीक है। ऐसा कोई क़ानून नहीं है लेकिन जो जनता की इच्छा है और जो जनता की आवश्यकता है उस की आप को इस तरह से उपेक्षा नहीं करनी चाहिये। आप को इस पर ग़ौर करना चाहिये। जब कपास की कीमत बढ़ी नहीं और कोई दूसरो परिस्थिति आई नहीं तो आप की इस तरह से दो दो मर्तबा कपड़े का दाम बढ़ाने का क्या हक़ है। आप को अधिकार है कि आप चाहे किसी की सिफारिश को मानें या ठुकरा दें, उसे सुनें या न सुनें, यह आप की मर्ज़ी है, लेकिन आप का यह तरीक़ा ठीक नहीं है। आज जो यह आध घंटे बहस के लिये मंजूर किया गया है इस में मैं जनता

की बात कहना चाहता हूं । अभी एक भाई ने इलेक्शन के समय का वादा और अपना अनुभव आप के सामने रखा है । मैं भी आप के सामने यह बात रखना चाहता हूं कि आप जनता की आवश्यकताओं को यह कह कर ठुकराने की कृपा न करें कि आप को कोई क़ानून टैरिफ़ बोर्ड की सिफारिशों को मानने के लिये वाध्य नहीं कर सकता है । यह आप के लिये अच्छा होगा और इस से ही मुल्क का कल्याण होगा और जनता भी यह समझेंगी कि वाकई इस मर्तबा जो जनता की तरफ़ से चुनाव हुआ है, पहला चुनाव हुआ है, उस के अनुसार बनी पार्लियामेंट में हमारी बात भी सुनी जाती है, उस पर ग़ौर किया जाता है । इस तरह से आप को टैरिफ़ बोर्ड की सब बात को नहीं ठुकराना चाहिये । (इस समय घंटी बजी) म एक दो मिनट और लूंगा ।

Mr. Speaker: There will be no time left for the hon. Minister to reply.

श्री रामजी वर्मा : में अभी खत्म करता हूं । मंत्री महोदय को मालूम नहीं, टैक्सटाइल कमिश्नर (Textile Commissioner) मोटे कपड़े की क़ीमत अपनी तरफ़ से बढ़ा देते हैं । इस तरह से आप दाम बढ़ने दीजियेगा तो यह जो नौकरशाही कहलाती है उस की मनमाना करने की मनोवृत्ति और बढ़ती है । इस तरह से तो अफ़सर जब चाहे दाम बढ़ा दिया करे । इस से जनता के हित का हनन होता है । इसलिये यह जो सवाल उठाया गया है में समझता हूं कि माननीय मंत्री इस पर फिर से ग़ौर करेंगे और गवर्नमेंट भी इस पर खास तरह से ग़ौर करेगी ।

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): I only want to ask one question, with your permission.

Mr. Speaker: He had not given notice.

Shri Gadgil: My question is most vital.

Mr. Speaker: Maybe, but he had not given notice.

Shri Gadgil: The question was whether...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: With regard to the points raised by my hon. friend there and by Mr. S. N. Das, I must say that the Government is as keen as they are in regard to this matter. The trouble is that we have to give a floor price for cotton and manufacturing costs and labour charges have to be taken into account. Ultimately, we find we have to fix a price which in all conscience is very high, and I would like to reduce it. But there is one misapprehension which I must remove. What we call coarse in our language does not happen to go to poor people, because often they use medium varieties and fine varieties are also in demand by them. I can assure my hon. friends that this is the concern of Government and we are trying to do our best, but we are tied by circumstances over which we have really no control.

With regard to the points raised by my hon. friend Shri Somani, I can say that there is no compulsion so far as the Textile Commissioner is concerned in making purchases of cotton. Allocations were made and the concerned people were told, "Allocations have been made. You may take delivery". After all, the Textile Commissioner did not know at that time that the prices were going to drop in the matter of *jarilla* from Rs. 820 to 610. They were taking trading risks and you cannot ask the Government to cushion those risks.

With regard to the question of providing for increased prices and the demand of the Textile Control Committee, as I have said before, the scheme of quotas was offered to them, but they said they would not take it. Later on, they said they wanted it and at that time we found that the consumers' interests did not warrant the Government accepting that proposition. We are here torn between our desire to keep cloth cheap and also provide reasonable return for the various interests and I feel that we are doing our very best.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Thursday, the 17th July, 1952.